Biogr.
152
i
2

Biogr. Eng.
152 i

Ruddiman

(Buchanan)

ANIMADVERSIONS

On a late PAMPHLET, intituled,

A VINDICATION

OF

Mr. GEORGE BUCHANAN, &c.

WHEREIN

The Arguments brought by its Author, for clearing BUCHANAN from the two great Faults he is charged with,

Are impartially examined and confuted.

By THO. RUDDIMAN, *A. M.*

Intolerabilis fit malitia, cum laudatur.

SIMONIDES.

Veritas occultari ad tempus poteſt, vinci non poteſt.

D. AUGUSTINUS.

Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina Mævi.

VIRG.

EDINBURGH,

Printed by T. and W. RUDDIMANS, and to be ſold at their Printing-houſe, and by the Bookſellers in Town.

MDCCXLIX.

Bibliotheca
Glasguensis
Mus. Gul.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

MDCCCXLIX.

Printed by T. and W. Ruddiman, and to be Sold at
EDINBURGH.

VIRG.

Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina Mævi.

D. AUGUSTINUS.

Noverit ecclesiasticæ lenitatis pectus, cujus non potest.

SINONIDES.

Intelligentia ei amicitia, cum fundatum.

BY THO. RUDDIMAN, A.M.

"Are impartially examined and confuted."

"Entitle me is expunged with."

Clearing Buchanan from the two great

The Arguments produced by his Author, for

MR. GEORGE BUCHANAN, &c.

OF

ANIMADVERSIONS

On a late Pamphlet, intituled,

ANIMADVERSIONS, &c.

AFTER the numberleſs Treatiſes, Pamphlets, and other ſcurrilous Writings, within theſe few Years publiſhed againſt me; at laſt comes forth one, from a Quarter I little expected, and on a Subject that has little or no Connexion with the Controverſy I was engaged in. As, in my Anſwer to Mr. *Logan*, and my Diſſertation concerning the Competition for the Crown of *Scotland* betwixt *Bruce* and *Baliol*, I have, I hope, to the Satisfaction of all impartial Judges, fully eſtabliſhed the Truth of the Argument I was challenged to defend; I might have treated this Pamphlet with the ſame Neglect that I have done moſt of thoſe others above-mentioned. But becauſe this Author, having, it ſeems, no other Way left him to vindicate his darling Writer, *Buchanan*, than by treating other great Men, no way inferior to him, and in ſome Reſpects very much his ſuperior, in a groſs and abuſive Manner, not to mention the Injuſtice done myſelf, I thought I had a Call to ſtand up in their and my own Defence; and that the more eſpecially, as it gives me an Opportunity to clear up ſome Matters of Fact relating to our Hiſtory, which this Author has very much miſrepreſented.

His Deſign, as he expreſſes it in his Title-page, is, to vindicate *Buchanan* from two Things: I. "From the "vile Aſperſion caſt on him by *Camden*, That he re-"pented, when dying, of what he wrote againſt *Mary* "Queen of *Scots*; which Falſhood has been ſince retail-"ed and propagated by Meſſrs. *Sage* and *Ruddiman*."

And II. " From the horrible Ingratitude he is charged " with to Q. *Mary*, in extolling her ſo high in his De- " dication of his Paraphraſe of the Pſalms, and thereaf- " ter writing ſo bitterly againſt her, in the Detection " and Hiſtory."

This Author introduces the firſt Part of his Performance with a lofty Encomium of *Buchanan*; as if his extraordinary Genius as a Poet, and the other excellent Talents he was endued with, which are not denied him by his greateſt Enemies, were ſufficient to atone for all the Faults that are otherwiſe laid to his Charge. Theſe his intellectual Accompliſhments I have on all Occaſions as highly extolled as this Author or any other could do; and which is more, I have, in a Treatiſe wrote for that particular Purpoſe, vindicated him from the unjuſt Attacks made upon his Honour and Reputation, in that Reſpect, by Mr. Auditor *Benſon*, and ſome other late Writers. It may indeed appear pretty ſingular, that this Author and I ſhould both ſtand up in defending *Buchanan*, and that we ſhould ſo far agree as to give our Pieces much the ſame Title, *viz.* A VINDICATION OF MR. GEORGE BUCHANAN. But herein lies the huge Difference betwixt us, that I juſtify that Part of his Character, in which I was perſuaded he was maltreated and injured; but in other Things, as a Lover of Truth, I take the Freedom to point out thoſe Things for which he deſerved to be blamed. I vindicate him as an admirable Poet, and a moſt elegant and fine Writer; but at the ſame Time, I condemn him, that, as an Hiſtorian, he has thrown many falſe Reproaches on the Memory of his ſovereign Lady and Miſtreſs Q. *Mary*. But this Author, partly from the Enmity that he and ſome others ſtill bear to that Queen, but chiefly from the over-weening Conceit that he and they have taken up of this their darling Writer, will have him to be abſolutely perfect, and (as he tells us in his P. 4.) *it provoked his Indignation* to find him accuſed of any Faults at all, eſpecially the two great ones with which he is charged by ſome Authors, *viz.* 1. The vile Aſperſions thrown upon Q. *Mary* in his Detection and Hiſtory: And 2. His Ingratitude for the

Favours he had received from that Queen. Tho' both these may be reduced to one, yet he has stated them under two different Heads. From the first he undertakes to vindicate him, by maintaining that all the ill Things *Buchanan* relates of Q. *Mary* were just and true, and that he being sensible of it to the last, as he needed not, so neither shewed he the least Repentance for what he had done, as some Authors affirm he did, a little before his Death. The second Accusation he thinks to take off, by endeavouring to shew, that *Buchanan* received no Favours from Q. *Mary*, and consequently that he could not be guilty of Ingratitude to her on that Account. How just the Vindicator is in his Reasoning on these two Heads, is what I am here to take under Consideration. And,

I. *Of* Buchanan's *Repentance.*

THE Authors that write of that Repentance, are, as he reckons them up, *Camden*, *Strada*, *Johnston*, and *Sage*, to whom he might have added Monsieur *Bayle*, in his historical Dictionary. And the first Method he takes to overthrow their Testimony, is to load them with a base and unworthy Character; not adverting, that all he says to their Disparagement falls more heavily upon his own *Buchanan.*

He begins *with opening up*, as he expresses it, *the Character of Mr.* Camden. And of him he tells us, "That "he was made one of the Ushers of *Westminster* School "founded by Q. *Elizabeth*, in which Station he served "for many Years, and was afterwards made chief Ma-"ster of that School, and at last was made by Q. *Eli-*"*zabeth*, *Clarencieux* King at Arms." But what is there reproachful or disadvantageous to Mr. *Camden*'s Character in all this! Was not almost the whole Life of *Buchanan*, both at Home and Abroad, employed the same Way that *Camden*'s was for only 22 Years, and that in much meaner and lower Stations than ever the other was placed in? Is it a Disparagement to Mr. *Camden*, that he was first Usher and then chief Master of one of the

greateſt and beſt endowed Schools in *Europe*, when the higheſt Preferment that *Buchanan* arrived at, while abroad, was to be Under-maſter of a Grammar School at *Bourdeaux* ?

The Vindicator is forced to own, " That without " Doubt *Camden* was a great Scholar, and an excellent " Antiquary, and that his *Britannia* acquired him a great " Reputation both at Home and Abroad." But then, ſpeaking of his Annals of Q. *Elizabeth*, " Which, *ſays* " *he*, he begun at *Cecil*'s Deſire, but after her [he ſhould " have ſaid *his*, i. e. *Cecil*'s] Death, he laid them aſide." *He adds*, " That had he dropt that Work altogether " thereafter, it had been much for that Queen's Honour, " and his own Reputation." But what Ground has this Author for that moſt unjuſt Reflexion ? None other but that *Camden*, from the undoubted Documents he had ſeen in the *Cottonian* Library and elſewhere, gives a Repreſentation of our *Scottiſh* Affairs quite contrary to what *Buchanan* relates of them. As for *Camden*'s Hiſtory of Q. *Elizabeth*, the Vindicator's Cenſure of it is ſo far from being juſt, that it has had the univerſal Approbation of the beſt Judges, both in this and other Countries, that it is one of the moſt finiſhed and exact Pieces of *Engliſh* Hiſtory ; of which innumerable Teſtimonies could be brought, if it were needful. How great a Regard that worthy Author paid to Truth, and all the Duties of a diligent and faithful Hiſtorian, may be learned from his own excellent Preface, to which I remit my Reader.

The next Author the Vindicator mentions, is *Famianus Strada*. Tho' this was indeed a polite and elegant Writer, yet as he was a Foreigner, and could know nothing of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, but by uncertain and vague Reports, and (as I acknowledge with Mr. *Sage*) that many Things in his Hiſtory are *too like Romance*, neither he nor I lay any Streſs on his Teſtimony.

The third who ſpeaks of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, is, Dr. *Robert Johnſton*, in his *Hiſtoria rerum Britannicarum, &c. ab anno* 1572 *ad* 1629. As he was a *Scotſman*, and might have had Opportunity of knowing more of that Matter than Strangers, and as he ſeems beſides to

have been a Perſon of great Veracity, his Authority is not in my Opinion to be altogether diſregarded. But if the Vindicator will think otherwiſe, I ſhall not diſpute the Point with him.

The laſt Author whom the Vindicator mentions to have wrote of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, is Mr. *Sage*, a Perſon of great Probity as well as Learning. But becauſe his Teſtimony is the moſt clear and diſtinct of any, it muſt be run down at any rate. And in order to this, the Vindicator will needs in the firſt Place give us a Character of that worthy Perſon; not from them that beſt knew him, but from his malicious and ſtated Enemy Mr. *Anderſon*, Miniſter firſt at *Dumbarton*, and afterwards at *Glaſgow*, who in his Anſwer to Mr. *Rhind*, Page 32. ſpeaks thus of him: " Mr. *Sage*, ſays he, was Maſter " of ſeveral good Qualifications, of a good Capacity, and " great Application." This is much from a declared Adverſary. But he adds, " That the Revolution had ſour- " ed his Temper, which carried him out often to tranſ- " greſs the Rules of Religion, as well as Decency." This laſt Part of that excellent Man's Character is groſly falſe. I myſelf, towards the End of his Life, had the good Fortune to be ſometimes in his Company, and ſo far was he from being of a ſour or moroſe Temper, that I hardly ever knew a Perſon of a more frank, eaſy and chearful Converſation. This is the Character that the late moſt learned and pious Mr. *Gillan*, who was his intimate and Boſom-Friend, gives us of him, in his Life written and publiſhed by him, and is no other than will appear to any that will read Mr. *Sage*'s moſt elaborate Writings; in which tho' he is ſometimes ſmart upon the groſs Ignorance and abſurd Reaſoning of his Antagoniſt Mr. *Rule*, yet muſt the Pleaſantry mixt with his Diſcourſe be equally entertaining and inſtructive to every Reader, but him who finds himſelf touched and nettled by it. But the contrary Character given by Mr. *Anderſon* comes ill from him, who was notoriouſly guilty of the Faults he accuſes Mr. *Sage* of, and notwithſtanding the Eſteem he is had in by ſome of the Zealots of the Party, was fitter for the Stage than the Pulpit. Witneſs his Writings againſt

the

the ſame Mr. *Sage* and others, and particularly that Buffoonry he publiſhed againſt two of his own Party, better and more learned Men than himſelf, *viz.* the late Mr. *Dunlop* and Mr. *Stewart*, the one Profeſſor of Church-Hiſtory, and the other of natural Philoſophy in the Univerſity of *Edinburgh*: But what far exceeded all the reſt is, the Satyr he wrote againſt the late Mr. *Robert Calder*, to which he gave the Title of *Curate* Calder *whipp'd*, and which, for the foul Language and *Billingsgate* of it, is hardly to be matched any where.

Having thus prepared his Reader, by blackening the Character of thoſe who ſpeak of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, and before he proceeds to weaken their Teſtimony on other Accounts, he brings two Counter-Teſtimonies, to prove that *Buchanan* was ſo far from repenting of what he had written of Q. *Mary*, "That when dying he de-
"clared to K. *James* her Son, that he might do what
"he pleaſed with his Writings after his Death, but, as
"what he had ſaid was all true, he would not revoke or
"alter any Article of it."—This is the Subſtance of what is related by thoſe Authors on that Subject. They are, Preſident *de Thou*, and Monſieur *Varillas*: But their Teſtimonies are not two but one Teſtimony, the ſecond being copied from the firſt. The one is taken from a Book intitled *Thuanus reſtitutus*, which was publiſhed by the *Dutch* Hiſtorian Mr. *Wicquefort*, and contains ſeveral Paſſages of that great Author's Hiſtories, which were not in ſome of the Copies of that vaſt Work. As to that particular Paſſage, Mr. *Varillas* ſays he ſaw it writ on the Margin of a Copy of Monſieur *de Thou*'s Hiſtory in the *French* King's Library. Theſe two Teſtimonies, (which, as I ſaid, are really but one) I reject; the firſt, becauſe that Author brings no Voucher for what he writes, and the ſecond becauſe he is *ſubleſtæ fidei ſcriptor, i. e.* a Hiſtorian of no Credit. But, ſays the Vindicator, "Is not *Cam-*
"*den* to be rejected by the ſame Rule, for he adduces no
"Voucher for what he ſays? Yes certainly; and Mr. *Rud-*
"*diman* would have done ſo in this Caſe, had he not been
"determined at any rate to believe this *Hearſay* of *Cam-*
"*den*." How juſt the Vindicator is to me in theſe laſt

Words,

Words, will appear afterwards. But even in this there is ſome Difference betwixt the Author of *Thuanus reſtitutus* and *Camden*; for the former, beſides his being a Foreigner, does not ſo much as ſay that he had heard it, but the latter ſays, *ut accepi*, i. e. *as I was informed*; and tho' indeed he does not name the Perſons, yet that had ſuch Weight with Monſieur *Bayle*, that he ſays, *there is no Compariſon betweene theſe two different Teſtimonies.*

But there was another Thing that made me diſregard that Teſtimony of *Varillas*, *viz.* That he contradicts himſelf, having in his Preface ſaid, that what he narrates of *Buchanan*'s Non-repentance was writ by the younger Monſieur *de Puy*; but in his Book he ſays it was wrote by *Thuanus* himſelf. It is pleaſant in the mean time to obſerve, how loth ſome People are to part with any thing that ſeems to make for them, come it from what Quarter ſoever. The Vindicator is not pleaſed that I ſhould call *Varillas*, *ſubleſtæ fidei ſcriptor*; when it is the ſame *Varillas* that has ſaid all the ill Things of *Buchanan*, that *Garaffa*, *Sandæus*, and other Popiſh Writers had ſaid of him before. And he might have known that Bp. *Burnet* has writ two Treatiſes of Reflexions on the groſs and innumerable Errors that Author is guilty of in his Hiſtories. But no Matter for that; what *Varillas* ſays here muſt be true, becauſe it anſwers the Vindicator's Purpoſe. His Words are ſo remarkable that I muſt ſet them down: " Mr. *Ruddiman*, *ſays he*, in a magiſterial " Way, very gravely pronounces *Varillas ſubleſtæ fi-* " *dei ſcriptor*, an Author not to be credited. If In- " conſiſtency, *adds he*, be a ſure Criterion for ſuch a " harſh Cenſure, I doubt Mr. *Ruddiman* will come but " badly off himſelf, for which I refer the Reader to the " Reverend Mr. *Logan*'s late Performance, *Mr.* Ruddi- " man *ſelf-condemned.*" Of this Fling he has here at me, I will take Occaſion to ſpeak afterwards. But he continues, " I do not, *ſays he*, ſee ſuch great Inconſiſtency " here in *Varillas*: For at firſt he might take it for *Thu-* " *anus*'s own Hand-writing, and afterwards when wri- " ting his Preface, he might more certainly know that

" it

" it was the Hand-writing of the younger *Puteanus*." *He adds*, " To me, and every unprejudiced Mind, it is " a Proof of *Varillas*'s Honesty and Candor, even tho' " he omitted acquainting the World, as ought to have " been done, that he formerly took it for *Thuanus*'s own " Hand : And if it was the Hand-writing of the young- " er *Puteanus*, it is no small Confirmation of the Fal- " shood of *Camden*'s Hearsay." That Observation of *Varillas*'s Inconsistency I owe to Mr. *Bayle*, and leave it to the Vindicator to make of it what he pleases ; especially as the Matter depends not so much on that Author's Veracity, as on that of *Thuanus*, which this Author however will have to be a mighty Confirmation of what the other had said.

But it is very strange in the Vindicator, that after all the Bustle he has made to prove *Buchanan*'s Non-repentance from the Authority of these two Historians, he is so inconsiderate as himself to destroy the Truth of what they say ; and that in his P. 41. where he shews it was impossible for K. *James* to entertain that Dialogue they speak of with *Buchanan* when a-dying, concerning his History : For he tells us, (I know not upon what Grounds) that *Buchanan*'s History was not, nor could be, published till the *October* after his Death, which happened on the 28th *September*, *anno* 1582. Now, it is acknowledged by him, and is confirmed by all our Histories, that K. *James*, after he had for some Days passed his Time in hunting in *Athole*, and had come towards *Perth*, was surprized by the Earl of *Gowrie* and his Accomplices, on the 23d *August* that Year, and was detained Prisoner by them near a whole Twelve-month thereafter. It was therefore impossible that K. *James* should desire *Buchanan* when dying to retract what he had writ in his History to the Dishonour of his Mother Q. *Mary*, when that History was not made publick till some Time (as our Author will have it) after *Buchanan*'s Death, which happened, as I said, several Months before the King had made his Escape out of the Hands of that wicked Faction which had made him Prisoner.

Come we now to examine what the Vindicator objects to the Teſtimonies of the other Writers that ſpeak of *Buchanan*'s Repentance. They are theſe three, *Camden*, *Strada* and Mr. *Sage*; to whom this Author adds Dr. *Johnſton*.

And firſt he ſays of *Camden*, that what he relates of that Matter was *Hearſay*. But what other Authority had *Buchanan* himſelf for a great Part of what he writes of Q. *Mary*, but *Hearſay*, or Information of others, to whoſe malicious Stories he gave too eaſy a Credit, and for which he is juſtly blamed by Sir *James Melvil?*

As to what is ſaid by *Strada* and Dr. *Johnſton*, of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, I have given my Sentiments a little before, P. 4. and 5.

But as Mr. *Sage*'s Teſtimony is that which preſſes hardeſt upon this Author, he is therefore at the greateſt Pains to evade the Force of it; for Mr. *Sage* not only tells the *Tale*, (ſo our Author will have it called) but alſo names the Perſon from whom he had it, *viz.* a worthy Gentlewoman, the Lady *Roſſyth*, a Perſon of very *bright Parts*, and of very *good Principles*, of which I ſuppoſe Honeſty and Veracity make no ſmall Part; and ſhe again informed him that what ſhe ſaid of *Buchanan*'s Repentance was frequently repeated to her by one *David Buchanan*, who was an Eye-witneſs of it.

It were endleſs to go through all the Shifts the Vindicator makes uſe of to deſtroy the Credit of this Teſtimony, for thirteen Pages together; tho' it is ſuch an one as moſt People are ſatisfied with in the common Concerns of Life. He allows Mr. *Sage* to have been a Perſon of Veracity; but then he ſays his Memory might have failed him, and much more that of the old Lady *Roſſyth*.——And upon this he makes the whole Relation evaniſh into a Dream. And here he brings in the great *Scaliger* complaining of his Memory; and adds, that I alſo, in my Anſwer to Mr. *Logan*, acknowledge that my Memory is not ſo retentive as it formerly had been. What follows from all this, but that no old Man or Woman ſhould be admitted as *habile* Witneſſes in any Court of Judicature? As if, forſooth, becauſe People's Memo-

ry fails them in many Things when they grow old, therefore they forget every Thing that did pass when they were young. This is so far from being true, that on the contrary old Men have generally a more distinct Remembrance of Things that happened when they were young, than of those that had occurred in their more advanced Years.

He comes next to *David Buchanan*, and is at great Pains to prove, that he could not be that *David Buchanan* who published *Knox*'s History *anno* 1644, with gross Interpolations of his own, which have misled learned Men. It is no Matter to me, whether he was the same, or a different Person; tho' all that is said by the Vindicator to make him different, is very far from being conclusive: For Instance, in P. 29. he will have it, "that "this Mr. *Buchanan* named by Mr. *Sage*, must have been "20 Years old, before he could be a Witness of what "past in the last Days of Mr. *George Buchanan*'s Life." Whereas I know nothing hinders but that this *David Buchanan* might have heard and seen what he relates of his Name-sake Mr. *George*, when he was not half that Age, and retain the Remembrance of it as long as he lived; for I myself remember perfectly well to have seen my Father weep upon the Death of K. *Charles* II. when I was but 10 Years, two Months, and 19 Days old.

But leaving the long *Fracas* the Vindicator makes about this *David Buchanan* for several Pages together; which (whoever he was) is of small Importance for overturning the Testimony given by him; he comes in the third Place, P. 37. to what he thinks will do his Business more effectually. He has hitherto run upon *Negatives*, by endeavouring to show, that what is said by those Writers above-named is unlikely to be true; but now he brings (in his Conceit) a *positive* Proof, that it was *impossible* it could be true. And this is a Passage from the Diary of one Mr. *James Melvil*, in which it is said, "That he went with his Brother *Andrew* (*a*) and *Tho-*

(*a*) These two Brothers, as also the Son of the former, named *James Melvil*, were great Incendiaries, and created more Trouble to

not

" *Thomas Buchanan*, to viſit Mr. *George* in the Month
" of *September*, *anno* 1582; that they went to the Print-
" ing-houſe, and obſerved that the Printer had come
" the Length of the 17th Book of his Hiſtory, where
" he ſpeaks of the Burial of *David Rizzio*; for which,
" without all Queſtion, he was obnoxious to the Re-
" ſentment of the King: That this might procure a Stop
" to the Work, if not a total Suppreſſion of it. *Tho-*
" *mas Buchanan*, *George*'s Kinſman, repreſented the Risk
" he did run from the Wrath and Hatred of the King.
" To whom *George* replied, *Tell me, Man, whether I*
" *have written the Truth and Matter of Fact.* Thomas
" anſwered, *So I think.* Then *George* ſaid, *I am not*
" *afraid of the Fury of the King and of his Courtiers:*
" *Pray for me; let God order all Things, provided that*
" *my Annals be compleatly printed.*"

Thus the Diary, on which this Author lays ſo mighty a Streſs. But let me, in my Turn, criticize a little upon the Words of it, as he has done on thoſe of Mr. *Sage*'s Letter. And,

1. It is obvious that it is a modern Compoſition, and not in the Language of that Time in *Scotland*; according to which, if it is genuine, it ought to have been given us.

2. It is called a *Diary*: Whereas this *Melvil* mentions only the Month, but not the Day of that Month, as in every exact Diary ought to be done. (*a*)

3. He ſays that it was in *September* 1582, that theſe three went to the Printing-houſe, and obſerved, *that the Printer had come the Length of the* 17*th Book of* Buchanan's *Hiſtory, where he ſpeaks of the Burial of* David Rizzio. It was on the 29th of *Auguſt*, *i. e.* not three Days before the Beginning of *September* 1582, that *Buchanan* dated the Dedication of his Hiſtory. But it is highly improbable that the Printer had then carried on the Work no further than the 17th Book, as there were yet

 three

not only K. *James*, but to the Church of *Scotland* in general, than any others; the ill Effects whereof are felt to this Day.

(*a*) *Calderwood* in his Church-hiſtory, ſpeaking of it, calls it his *Memorials*.

three long Books of it to be printed before the Dedication, which is prefixed to the whole, could come to the Preſs, and which is dated, as I ſaid, not three full Days before that *September* : And as Printing was but little cultivated in *Scotland* at that Time, it is not likely that theſe three laſt Books could be printed off in ſo ſhort a Space.

4. How comes *Melvil* to ſay, *that the Printer had come the Length of the* 17*th Book, where* Buchanan *ſpeaks of the Burial of* David Rizzio ; when what is ſaid of that Burial are almoſt the laſt Words, and within a few Lines of the End of that Book ? He ſhould therefore have ſaid that the Printer had come the Length of the 18th Book.

5. All *Buchanan*'s three Viſitants ſhew themſelves ſenſible, that the vile Things ſaid of Q. *Mary*, with reſpect to the Circumſtances of *Rizzio*'s Burial, were ſuch as could not fail *to render* Buchanan *obnoxious to the King*'s *Reſentment :* Which is a tacite Acknowledgment, that even in the Opinion of *Buchanan*'s Friends, ſuch baſe Reproaches thrown upon the Queen, tho' they had been true, as they were infinitely falſe, ought not to have been committed to Hiſtory ; they being ſuch as could not but throw a Blot upon their preſent Sovereign, and his Poſterity.

6. *Buchanan*'s own Kinſman is here introduced as repreſenting the Risk he run *from the Wrath and Hatred of the King* ; And what he ſays is very juſt ; for I ſhall not ſay, what King, but what Perſon, that had any Regard to the Reputation of his Family, could not take it heinouſly ill, to have it publiſhed to the World, that his Mother was ſtained with the blackeſt of Crimes, and that by his own *Preceptor*, who did eat of his Meat, and drink of his Cup, and owed ſo much (as I ſhall ſhew afterwards) to his and his Mother's Bounty ?

7. I do not ſee how *Thomas Buchanan* could ſpeak of the Risk his Kinſman did run from the King's Fury and Hatred for what he had written againſt his Mother ; for at that Time K. *James* was in the Hands of the Earl of *Gowrie*, and the Rump of that Faction which had dethroned Q. *Mary*, and did not recover his Liberty till many Months after

after *Buchanan*'s Death: This theſe three holy Brethren very well knew, their Kirk, in their Aſſemblies, having approved of, and thanked God for what that Faction had done, in making and detaining the King their Priſoner. Whatever therefore *Buchanan* had Reaſon to fear from the Hand of God, he had nothing to fear from the King's Reſentment; ſince he was within a few Weeks (I may ſay Days) of being put without the Reach of all earthly Power.

8. And laſtly, This is much confirmed by the Anſwer made, in the Diary, by Mr. *George Buchanan* to his ſaid Kinſman, *That he was not afraid of the Fury of the King, and of his Courtiers*: For I ask, how comes *Buchanan* here to ſpeak of the *Fury of K.* James's *Courtiers*, when he knew that many of thoſe whom the King had then about him, and who had made themſelves his *Courtiers*, were his Mother's greateſt Enemies, and had no ſmall Hand in propagating thoſe vile Calumnies againſt her?

What I have obſerved of this *Diary* ſeems to render it a little ſuſpicious, and not to be ſuch an authentick Piece as this Author would have it. But tho' every Word of it were literally true, yet it is not altogether impoſſible but that this ſame *Buchanan*, upon the nearer Approaches of Death, and his being on the Brink of ſtepping into the other World, might repent and be ſorry for what he had done. However, to pleaſe this Author, I ſhall retract the former Opinion I had of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, and upon the Faith of that Diary *be inclined to believe* that what is ſaid of it by the above Writers is fictitious. But, alas! what will his great Admirers gain by that Conceſſion? Only this, that they make him die an hardened and impenitent Sinner; and rather than his Reputation, or more truly that of their own Cauſe, ſhould ſuffer in this World, they chooſe (*horreſco referens!*) to let him drop into Hell in the next.

And this brings me to that Part of the Vindicator's Pamphlet, which is principally levelled againſt myſelf.

In order to repreſent the Matter aright, and as it truly is, I muſt in the firſt Place ſet down the two Paſſages on which

which this Author's Accuſation of, and Indignation againſt me, with reſpect to *Buchanan*'s Repentance, are founded.

The former is a Note I had written on *Buchanan*'s Life, P. 11. where, being obliged by what Monſieur *Bayle* and others have ſaid of it, to mention that Author's repenting for what he had written to the Reproach of Q. *Mary*, I firſt ſet down, what *Camden* and *Strada* on the one Side, and the Publiſher of *Thuanus reſtitutus*, and *Varillas* on the other, relate of that Matter. And then my Words are theſe, *Ex pugnantibus hiſce fronte adversâ ſententiis quam potiſſimam ſequar nequeo ſatis expedire; ad Camdeni tamen teſtimonium magis inclinat animus.* And for this I ſubjoin my Reaſons, the chief whereof, I own, is what is ſaid of it in that Letter of Mr. *Sage*. Can any Thing be leſs preſuming or offenſive than theſe my Words? I do not ſay *that I believe*, but only *that I incline to believe*, what Mr. *Camden* ſays of *Buchanan*'s Repentance. And is my Faith ſo to be tied down to the Opinion of others, that I dare not ſo much as *incline to think* otherwiſe than they would have me?

The other Paſſage is in my Anſwer to Mr. *Logan*, P. 309. in theſe Words: " Our Author [Mr. *Logan*, " in his firſt Treatiſe on Government, P. 137.] here " takes Occaſion to caſt it in Mr. *Sage*'s Teeth, that " he has, upon the Faith of others, related two Things, " one of Mr. *George Buchanan*, and another of Mr. *A-* " *lexander Henderſon*, both Men of great Figure and " Note. How far what Mr. *Sage* reports of them is true, " or how great Faith he gave to them, or they deſerved, " is not now my Buſineſs to enquire. All I ſhall ſay of " them is, that, in my Opinion, they are on the chari- " table Side, as ſignifying that theſe Men, great and e- " minent as they were, did in their laſt Hours teſtify " their Repentance for the great Injuries they had done, " the one to Q. *Mary*, and the other to K. *Charles* I. " And if they did not, as our Author would have it (for " which I pray God to forgive him) they have now a " heavier Account to make: And whether they did or " not, I am ſure they ought to have repented." From this

this, (whatever elſe the Vindicator may quarrel in theſe Words) I leave it to the World to judge, how unjuſt he is to me, in ſaying in his Title-page, *that the Falſhood* (for ſo he will have it) *of* Buchanan's *Repentance has been retailed and propagated by me*; when it is manifeſt, that not I, but his Friend Mr. *Logan*, who, to ſhew his Spite to Mr. *Sage*, has here, without any Occaſion for it, brought that Matter again upon the Carpet.

Upon this, however, the Vindicator breaks forth in a great Rage againſt me, P. 45. But nothing offends him ſo much as my ſaying, "*That Mr.* Sage's *Words* "*are on the charitable Side; and if* Buchanan *did not* "*repent, he has now a heavier Account to make*, &c. "The ſlandering and reproaching *Buchanan, ſays he*, "in this malicious Manner, can never be on the chari- "table Side. *Charity*, ſaith St. *Paul, thinketh no Evil*, "*rejoiceth not in Iniquity, but rejoiceth in the Truth.*" This Author can quote Scripture, as once the Devil did to our bleſſed Lord: But let him turn the Tables, and apply theſe excellent Words of the Apoſtle to his great Favourite *Buchanan*. Where was his *Charity?* How did he *rejoice in the Truth*, and *not in Iniquity*, who could not only ſpeak, but tranſmit to Poſterity the fouleſt Slanders and Reproaches, againſt all Truth, as well as Charity, that can be caſt upon a Woman, not to ſay his own Sovereign Lady and Queen, to whom he was indebted for ſo many ſignal Favours, if not for his very Life? But it would ſeem with this Author, that he and thoſe of his Party are not tied down to the common Precepts of Chriſtianity, that they have the Privilege to revile and reproach others, and that in the moſt outragious Manner; but that in others it is a Crime to blame their Wickedneſs, and to ſay, that they needed to repent, and to crave God's Forgiveneſs for it.

But let us hear this Author's following Words: "Is "not this Manner of ſpeaking, *ſays he*, a moſt horrid "and unwarrantable calumniating of a Man vaſtly ſu- "perior to himſelf [*i. e.* me] in every Reſpect?" That *Buchanan* was vaſtly ſuperior to me in many Reſpects I ſhall readily grant him; but there is one *Reſpect* in which

above

bove all others he moſt excells me, *viz.* The Art of clothing in fine Language the moſt atrocious and grievous Calumnies that can be uttered. This is a Glory I ſhall not envy him, and let his Votaries extol him for it as much as they pleaſe. But what has ſuch an invidious Compariſon to do in this Matter? For if we are to deal in Compariſons, I hope the Vindicator will allow that Q. *Mary*, and the great Men that eſpouſed her righteous Cauſe, were as much at leaſt ſuperior to *Buchanan*, as *Buchanan* was or could be to me. And was it *a moſt horrid and unwarrantable Calumny* to quarrel the moſt outragious Calumniator that ever put Pen to Paper, and who has filled the ſix laſt Books of his Hiſtory with a Train of the moſt arrant Calumnies, Falſhoods and Lies, that the like, I verily believe, are not to be found in any Hiſtory whatſoever? And is the Character of a great Queen, and of many others of the higheſt Quality in the Kingdom to be torn in Pieces, and to be trampled upon in the moſt diſgraceful Manner by him; and yet he himſelf all the while be irreproachable, and to be look'd upon as one of thoſe *righteous* Perſons, who (as our Saviour ſpeaks) *needed no Repentance?*

But what moſt of all galls this Author, is that I ſhould have ſaid, *that if* Buchanan *did not repent of the Injuries he has done* Q. Mary, *he has now the heavier Account to make.* Theſe indeed are my Words, and I ſtill adhere to them; That if *Buchanan* did not repent of the foul Language he has vented againſt that Princeſs, as ſure as the Goſpel is true, he had no Title to eternal Salvation: For tho' it ſhould be granted (which is all that can be ſaid in his Vindication) that he himſelf was perſuaded of the Truth of all that he relates of that Queen, yet the bitter and virulent Manner in which he relates them is utterly inexcuſable. This Author can tell us, that Archbiſhop *Spotiſwood* relates the ſame Things of Q. *Mary* that *Buchanan* does; which yet, in a great Number of the groſſeſt Inſtances, is far from being true. But does the Archbiſhop narrate them in the ſame virulent and ſcurrilous Language that is uſed all along by *Buchanan?* So far from it, that the ſame *Spotiſwood* (as

this

this Author owns, P. 50.) ſays, " that *Buchanan*'s Bit-
" terneſs in writing of the Queen, and of the Troubles
" of the Time, *all wiſe Men have diſliked*." This the Vindicator will have to be an Inconſiſtency in *Spotſwood*: As if, forſooth, a Man could not give a juſt Narrative of Things, unleſs it was done in a vile and opprobrious Manner. The Archangel *Michael* durſt not bring a railing Accuſation againſt the Devil himſelf: And, pray what hindered him, but that it was unworthy of a pure Angel to deal in that ſort of Language, tho' againſt the wickedeſt of all God's Creatures? And ſhall we think it commendable, or even allowable, in us poor Mortals, who have ſo many Sins of our own to anſwer for, to break forth into railing and abuſive Expreſſions, in deſcribing the Vices of others, tho' they were true, as thoſe which *Buchanan* imputes to Q. *Mary* are infinitely far from being ſo?

And yet this Author has the Confidence to upbraid me for condemning theſe Things in *Buchanan*, and ſaying that he needed to repent of them, and that if he did not, he was guilty before God: " Is this like a Chriſtian, " *ſays he?*" And then he adds another Scripture Text, " *Who art thou that judgeſt another Man's Servant?* " *Judge not before the Time.*" But did *Buchanan* obſerve this Rule, who took upon him to judge and condemn his own Miſtreſs before the Time, and to do all that he could to render her infamous to all Generations? It is a new and ſtrange Doctrine this, that to paſs a juſt Cenſure upon a Slanderer is Slander. At this rate no innocent Perſon can defend himſelf againſt the falſe Accuſations of others, or ſay that they are in the wrong who go about to rob him of his good Name, which, with all virtuous Perſons, is more valuable than Life itſelf. As to the Scriptures this Author cites, none, I ſuppoſe, will ſay, that they are to be taken in an univerſal Latitude. Our bleſſed Lord himſelf, tho', *Matth.* vii. 1. he condemns all raſh and uncharitable *judging*; yet, in the ſame Chapter, he bids his Diſciples *beware of falſe Prophets, that come in Sheeps Clothing, but inwardly are ravening Wolves*; adding, that *by their Fruits* they *ſhould*

know them. But how could they know them by their Fruits, without paſſing ſuch a Judgment on them as their Actions diſcovered to be juſt and true? Nay, if it were otherwiſe, there would be an End of all civil Society, and no Redreſs could be had for what Injuries Men may ſuffer from others, either in their Character, Perſon or Eſtate.

But becauſe Mr. *Logan*, in his *Finiſhing Stroke*, *Part* 1. *P.* 114. loudly quarrels me for taking upon me to interpret Scripture, who am no Clergyman, I ſhall therefore give him the Sentiments of a learned and pious Divine of our neighbouring Church, Mr. *Jerem. Seed*, as to that Matter. That excellent Preacher, in his Sermon on that Text, *James* iv. 11. *Speak not Evil one of another, Brethren*, tho' he highly condemns that Vice of *Evil-ſpeaking*, yet he lays down no fewer than five Caſes, in which it is not only lawful, but ſometimes neceſſary, to ſpeak and write againſt the Faults of our Neighbour. Of theſe I ſhall only mention the 2d and 5th. In the former, ſays he, "It is no Crime to deſcant on the Faults "of our Neighbour which are publick and notorious: "For where can be the Harm for any Man to talk of "what every one knows?" But was it ſo of the Crimes *Buchanan* accuſes Q. *Mary* of, when all of them can be proved to be groſly falſe, and many of them ſuch as could not be perpetrated but in a ſecret and hidden Manner?

The latter is in theſe Words: "We are, ſays Mr. "*Seed*, ſo far from acting againſt the Precept of my "Text, that it is an Act of Charity, as well as Juſtice, "to ſtrip the Wolf of his Sheep's Clothing, which he "has put on to make a Prey of the innocent and un-"ſuſpecting. It is a Matter of great Conſequence to the "Publick, that the Characters of wicked Men ſome-"times ſhould be univerſally known, as well as the "Character of the virtuous. It is highly neceſſary thoſe "ſhould be undeceived, who repoſe a Confidence in one "that may bear a fair Character, but is no better than a "Villain." [*But what will this Author ſay, when it can be demonſtrated, that* Murray, Morton, *and not improbably*

bably Buchanan *himſelf, are ſuch Perſons as are here deſcribed ?*] But to go on with Mr. *Seed*: " Where a " Man's Vices, *adds he*, only hurt himſelf, and termi- " nate in his own Perſon, then we have no Right to pu- " bliſh them, becauſe we can anſwer no good End there- " by: But where they affect or may affect others, it is " our Duty to warn as many as we think proper, a due " Regard being had to our own Safety. Only let us take " this Caution along with us; before we endeavour to " undeceive others, let us be ſure we are not deceived " ourſelves. That Rule which a celebrated Philoſopher " laid down for the Conduct of the Underſtanding " in judging of the Truth of Things, is as neceſſary " for judging aright of the Characters of Men, *viz.* Al- " ways to ſuſpend our Judgment till we have got clear, " diſtinct and deciſive Evidence. Never proceed upon " ſlender Surmiſes, and precarious Conjectures, the " Workmanſhip of the Brain. Proportion your Aſſent " to the Clearneſs of the Proofs on which it is built."

Thus that truly pious and judicious Divine: And they were ſuch Conſiderations as he here ſuggeſts that moved me to condemn the vile Aſperſions caſt upon Q. *Mary* by *Buchanan*: And I can affirm, that I have not proceeded *upon ſlender Surmiſes, and precarious Conjectures, the Workmanſhip of the Brain*; but, as that Author directs, I can produce an Evidence for what I ſay, as clear, diſtinct and deciſive, as any Matter of Fact at that Diſtance is capable of. But if, all this notwithſtanding, the ſuperlative Admirers of that otherwiſe great and learned Man will ſtill juſtify all that he has written of that Queen, I will ſay with the Poet on a like Occaſion:

Stultus & improbus hic amor eſt, dignuſque notari; that it procceds from a blind Fondneſs (*a*), and not a rational Eſtimate of Perſons and Things; and that this Author may as well approve of King *David*'s Adultery and Murder, which it is certain he heartily repented of; as to ſay that *Buchanan* needed no Repentance for his moſt

 falſe

(*a*) ——————— ἦ χὠ ἕρωτι
Πολλάκις, ὦ Πολύφαμε, τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πίφανται. Theocr.

falſe and malicious Accuſation of Q. *Mary* as guilty of thoſe Crimes.

Having thus juſtified, ſo far as I am concerned, all that I have ſaid of *Buchanan*'s Repentance, to the Satiſfaction, I hope, of all reaſonable Men, for to ſuch only I appeal, I might here leave off, and not proceed any further. But, becauſe there are many other Things, in which (tho' for the moſt Part extrinſick to the Cauſe he and I are upon) the Vindicator ſhews his Ill-will, not only to myſelf, but to other Perſons, of far greater Note and Conſideration than either of us, I thought it would not be amiſs to glance at the baſe Characters he gives of ſome of them, and to vindicate both them and myſelf from his Reproaches. And,

1. After the laudable Cuſtom of the Party, as *Buchanan* rail'd at the Mother, ſo does this Author at her Son K. *James*, of whom he gives a moſt vile and unworthy Character, by telling us, P. 13. " That after he took " the Reins of Government into his Hands, he was ſo " fickle and inconſtant in his Way, ever guided and " influenced by ſome one or other of his Favourites at " Court, ſome of whom were but very indifferent Men, " that he could never be depended on." This is moſt injurious to the Memory of that good and pious Prince, taken from the Hiſtories and Pamphlets of thoſe that were his declared Enemies. But, O! had that King ſuffered himſelf to be *guided* and *influenced* by thoſe godly Reformers, who depoſed, and upon the Matter murdered his Mother, how glorious a King would he have been! But then it muſt have been on that peremptory Condition, that he ſhould entirely depend upon them, and not they on him.

The Vindicator has next the Confidence to deny the Truth of *Gowrie*'s Conſpiracy againſt that King, and to turn it into a Conſpiracy of the King againſt the Earl of *Gowrie*: When the late Earl of *Cromarty* has put that Matter into ſuch a Light, from all the Evidence that a Matter of Fact can have, that if that Earl was not guilty, we can hardly be ſure that ſuch an Earl ever exiſted. But *Gowrie* was then a prime Pillar of the Kirk; his

his Father had ſuffered in its Cauſe; and therefore the moſt convincing Proofs muſt be baffled, and turned into Ridicule for his Sake.

The third Thing the Vindicator accuſes K. *James* of, is, that he *ſigned a Warrant for razing out Leaves from the Regiſters of the Acts of Aſſembly*. This was certainly, in our Author's Opinion, a moſt ſacrilegious Deed. But what did theſe Acts contain? The moſt arrant and flagrant Treaſon that ever was recorded. In one of them the venerable Aſſembly approve what *Gowrie*, and the other LORDS REFORMERS (for ſo they piouſly call them) had done in making the King their Priſoner, and declared it *good* and *lawful Service*: And in another they exalt the Power of their Miniſters to a greater Height than ever was done in any Chriſtian Country, that of the Popiſh Church hardly excepted. They allowed their Preachers to rail againſt the King from their Pulpits, and would neither condemn them for ſo doing themſelves, nor ſuffer the King to call them to Account for it. And were ſuch Indignities to be born by any that deſerved the Name of King? Or was he to be blamed for cauſing ſuch Acts to be razed out of their treaſonable Records? But with what Face can this Author quarrel K. *James* for doing that, of which thoſe godly Miniſters themſelves had ſet him the Example? For did not they, by an Act of their Aſſembly, order the *Act of Privy Council againſt Mr.* John Dury, (who had been baniſhed for reviling the King in his Sermons) *to be delete, and the Acts of Council, and other Acts indefinitely made againſt the King's abſolute Power*, (for ſo they called all Power that interfered with their own ſupreme and paramount Dominion) *to be delete, and never to be remembered any more?* For this ſee their own Hiſtorian *Calderwood*, P. 136. (*a*)

He adds 4thly, "That K. *James*'s Veracity could "not be depended on when he went to *England*: Wit-

"neſs

(*a*) See more of the wild Pranks of thoſe godly Reformers at that Time and afterwards, in the Earl of *Cromarty's Vindication of his hiſtorical Account of the Conſpiracies of the Earls of* Gowrie, *from the Miſtakes of Mr.* John Anderſon.

" neſs, *ſays he*, his practiſing upon the illuſtrious Pre-
" ſident Monſieur *de Thou*, by *Camden*, and that merce-
" nary Hireling he kept, *Iſaac Caſaubon*, to conceal and
" pervert the Truth, with reſpect to his Mother and her
" Conduct, in the Hiſtory of his own Time he was then
" writing." There can be nothing more falſe and malicious than this is. King *James*, as it became a dutiful Son, could not but take it ill that Preſident *de Thou* ſhould inſert in his Hiſtory all the vile Things *Buchanan* had ſaid of his Mother: And *de Thou* might have known that that Author's Writings were, on Account of thoſe very Things, condemned by Act of Parliament in *Scotland*, near 20 Years before K. *James* went to *England*. Was it not then highly laudable in him, ſo far as he could, to cauſe Juſtice to be done to his Mother's Honour? He perfectly knew, from undoubted Evidence, that what that otherwiſe great Man *de Thou*, had, by truſting too much to *Buchanan*, wrote concerning his Mother, were falſe; and he could do no leſs than inſiſt upon his retracting them in his next Edition.

2. The next Perſon whom the Vindicator attacks, is Mr. *Camden*, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the Accounts he gives of Q. *Mary* are contrary to what *Buchanan* relates of her. I have ſaid ſomething of that truly good and learned Man before; and I here add, that whoever reads the Letters writ to him by ſome of the moſt eminent Men then in *Europe*, which are ſubjoined to his Life by the Reverend Dr. *Thomas Smith*, will ſee that his Character was the very reverſe of what this Author gives of him. He ſays, " he was an Enemy to the
" *Puritans*, and to Mr. *Buchanan*." *Camden* was a Perſon of ſuch a truly Chriſtian and benevolent Diſpoſition, that he hated no Man; the Principles indeed of the *Puritans* and *Buchanan* he juſtly deteſted, as ſubverſive of all good Order, and, wherever received and put in Practice, productive of the greateſt Miſchiefs that can happen to human Society.

This Author adds, in a marginal Note, " That *Cam-*
" *den* repented of having his Annals interpolated by K.
" *James*." But what Proof brings he of this? No other

than

than that *he ſent the 2d Volume, to be publiſhed after his Death, to* Paris, *to* Pierre du Puy. As to the Interpolations ſaid to have been made to *Camden*'s 1ſt Volume by K. *James*, I refer the Reader to what Dr. *Smith* writes of them, in the Life of that great Man; namely, that he, before he ſhould make his Work publick, thought fit to put it into the Hands of K. *James*, for no other End, *quàm ut veritas magis magiſque erueretur, aut ſi quicquam ipſi minùs intento, aut non probè edocto, ſubrepſiſſet, regiis curis limatum emendaretur.* There was none better acquainted, as none had better Reaſon, with *Scots* Affairs, than K. *James* himſelf. To whom then could *Camden* more fitly apply for reviſing his Hiſtory, eſpecially thoſe Parts of it relating to that King's Mother, than to her Son? And as to thoſe pretended Interpolations, as they could only or chiefly concern the Affairs of *Scotland*, there is nothing ſaid of them by *Camden*, but what can at this Day be evinced to be genuine and certain Truths.

That he delayed the Publication of his 2d Volume till after his Death, the obvious Reaſon was, that as hiſtorical Truth obliged him to write ſeveral Things which might give Offence to ſome great ones then alive, ſo he thought proper to ſuſpend the Impreſſion till his own Death had put him out of the Reach of their Reſentment. It was for the ſame Reaſon that the great Preſident *de Thou* thought fit to put the laſt and moſt perfect Copy of his Hiſtories into the Hands of his moſt truſty Friends, the ſame *Peter du Puy*, *Nic. Rigault*, and *Geo. Mich. Lingelſhem*, not to be printed till ſometime after he himſelf was in the other World. And, to name no more, it was for the very ſame Reaſon that Bp. *Burnet*, whoſe Hiſtory of his own Time is in ſo great Vogue with this Author and his Party, ordered the firſt Volume of it not to be publiſhed till ſeven Years, and the ſecond not till 14 Years after his Death. And good Reaſon had he ſo to do; for, except three or four, and his own beloved ſelf, he hardly ſpeaks Good of any one Perſon in either.

But the moſt unaccountable of all, are the Words with which the Vindicator concludes this Paragraph: "To ſum up, *ſays he*, *Camden*'s Character, he was "*omnium*

* *omnium ſcenarum homo*, a great Temporizer." Who would not but infer from this, that *Camden* was inconſtant in his Conduct, and that he often ſhifted Sides, as Intereſt or Ambition determined him? But nothing can be more falſe than this is. *Camden*'s Writings are all uniform and of a Piece: All the Favours he received, he had from Q. *Elizabeth*, but from K. *James* none; unleſs it was, that that King had that juſt Eſteem of him which his great Learning and Virtue deſerved. So far was he from Ambition, that he would not accept the Honour of Knighthood which K. *James* offered him; and ſo well contented was he with his worldly Condition, and ſo little inclined to be about Court, that he refuſed the Place of Maſter of Requeſts, to which Q. *Elizabeth* would have promoted him. For this ſee Dr. *Smith*'s Account of his Life, P. 75. but eſpecially his own Letter to that Prodigy of Learning Dr. *Uſher*, afterwards the great Archbiſhop of *Armagh*; ſome Part of which I have put in the Margin. (*a*)

3. The next Thing I ſhall take Notice of, tho' not in the Order this Author has placed it, is the two very different Characters he gives of the two *Spotſwoods*, Father and Son; the one Superintendent of *Lothian*, and the other Archbiſhop of *St. Andrews*. The former being ſuch as his Heart could deſire, the Vindicator extols to the Skies: "It is well known, *ſays he*, P. 47, that "Mr. *Spotſwood* was a Man of a fine Character, of great "Eſteem and Note in thoſe Times, and had better Acceſs to know the Truth than any Man now living can "pretend to" (*b*). But what is the Reaſon of the high Com-

(*a*) I know not who may juſtly ſay that I was ambitious, who contented myſelf in *Weſtminſter* School, when I writ my *Britannia*, and 11 Years afterwards; who refuſed a Maſterſhip of Requeſts, offered; and then had the Place of a King of Arms, without any Suit, caſt upon me. I did never ſet Sail after preſent Preferment, or deſired to ſoar higher by others. I never made Suit to any Man, no not to his Majeſty, but for a Matter of Courſe incident to my Place; neither, God be praiſed, needed I, having gathered a contented Sufficiency by my long Labours in the School. *Camd. Epiſt.* 195. *p.* 247.

(*b*) It is not true that *Spotſwood*, the Superintendent, had better Acceſs to know the Truth of thoſe Matters than any Man now living can pre-

Commendation given by this Author to that Superintendent? No other but that ſpiteful and virulent Admonition he gave to his Clergy againſt Q. *Mary*, and which this Author's Friend Mr. *Logan* thought ſo valuable a Piece, that he has given it a Place in his firſt Treatiſe, P. 88. The Vindicator is very angry with me for calling that Admonition *ſpiteful*. But let any Man read it, and not be ſatisfied that it diſcovers the moſt outragious and barbarous Fury of its Author againſt Q. *Mary*, that can poſſibly in Words be expreſſed; and then I ſhall retract the Epithet of *ſpiteful*, which I had given it, and call it, as he obſerves Bp. *Keith* had done, a *pithy* Admonition, without adding the Reaſon for which that Hiſtorian had given it that Name.

But when this Author comes to ſpeak of the Superintendent's Son, the Archbiſhop; *quantum mutatus ab illo*, how unlike is he to his Father, in the Vindicator's Conceit? Here the philoſophical Maxim he makes good, that *contrariorum contrariæ ſunt affectiones & effectiones*; for thoſe that ſpeak ill of Q. *Mary* or her Son K. *James*, are this Author's darling Favourites. But ſuch as ſay any Thing to their Commendation, or in their Defence, muſt paſs with him for Perſons of no Credit. Accordingly, in his P. 49. he will have the Archbiſhop to have been nothing but *a great Sycophant and Court Flatterer*; and that for no other Reaſon that I can ſee, but becauſe he wrote not of Q. *Mary* with the ſame Gall and Venom that his Father had done. But how far the Archbiſhop was from being a *Sycophant* or *Court Flatterer*, appears from this, that, even according to the Vindicator, he relates many of thoſe ill Things of Q. *Mary* which *Buchanan* had done before him; which ſurely was not the Way of making his Court to her Son. K. *James*.

pretend to; for (not to mention the innumerable Documents which he never ſaw, which clear up Q. *Mary*'s Innocence) the wicked Plot which was carrying on againſt that Queen, by *Murray*, *Morton*, &c. was to be kept ſo ſecret, and to be communicated only to thoſe few that were to be the principal Actors in it, that the far greater Part both of the Clergy and Laity at that Time were utterly in the Dark about it.

4. But the Vindicator has reſerved the chief Part of his Wrath and Indignation to be poured forth upon *Iſaac Caſaubon*; that *Iſaac Caſaubon*, whoſe conſummate Learning, immortal Writings, ſolid Piety, ſweet and inoffenſive Manners, procured him not only the Love and Eſteem, but the Admiration of the greateſt Men of the Age he lived in, and ever ſince (*a*). But what is it that has raiſed this Author's Fury againſt him? Why, only this, that he was, by the Recommendation of Archbiſhop *Spotſwood*, invited to come over to *England*, by that moſt learned Prince, and great Encourager of Learning K. *James* VI. who not only provided liberally for him, but admitted him into great Familiarity with him. He highly commends the Learning, Piety, and other excellent Qualities of that Prince, and ſpeaks favourably of his Mother Q. *Mary*. This was the *prima mali labes*, the Source of the Reproach caſt upon that great Man by our Author and the Zealots of his Party; who, as they can never be reconciled to thoſe Princes, can as little endure that any ſhould expreſs a good Opinion of them.

In the Preface to *Buchanan*'s Works I had ſet down a Letter of Mr. *Caſaubon* to Preſident *De Thou*, writ 25. *February* 1611, in which he condemns *Buchanan*'s Book, *De jure regni*, and the horrible Reproaches thrown out upon K. *James*'s Mother in his Hiſtory: And tho' there is nothing in that Letter but what can be demonſtrated to be juſt and true, yet it has provoked the Spleen and Rage of this Author to a hideous Degree. Upon this he has the Ill-nature to ſay, Append. P. 74. "That *Caſaubon* was "kept by K. *James* under Penſion, and employed as "his

(*a*) The great *Joſ. Scaliger*, who was himſelf perhaps the moſt learned Man of his Age, and is not very liberal in his Commendations of others, yet owns himſelf inferior to *Caſaubon*: *Que Monſ. Caſaubon*, ſays he, *eſcrit bien Latin.——Caſaubonus doctiſſimus. Ego ejus diſcipulus; guſtum habeo rerum, ſed non doctrinam.——C'eſt le plus grand homme que nous avons en Grec. Je lui cede.—— Eſt doctiſſimus omnium qui hodie vivunt* See *Scaligerana ſecunda*, Art. *Caſaubon*; where he alſo tells us, that he carefully preſerved his Letters: And good Reaſon he had; for there is nothing equal to them ſince *Pliny* the younger's Time, in Latin, or perhaps any other Language.

" his mercenary Hireling, in writing that and ſeveral o-
" ther Letters to *De Thou*, with Deſign to bias and pre-
" judice that great Man, and noble Hiſtorian, when wri-
" ting the Hiſtory of Q. *Mary*." Whereas the Truth is, that that illuſtrious Preſident having (as he tells us in his Letter to *Camden*, written 13th *April* 1608, *St. novo*, *inter Camdeni epiſtolas*, No. 71.) no other Hiſtorian but *Buchanan* to direct him in *Scottiſh* Affairs, he (bating the virulent Manner in which they are related) gives us much the ſame Account of Things that that Author before him had done. But it being diſcovered, that the vile Aſperſions caſt upon Q. *Mary*'s Memory by *Buchanan*, are groſs and impudent Falſhoods, was it a Fault in *Caſaubon*, (from the great Friendſhip that ſubſiſted between him and Monſieur Preſident *De Thou*) to let him know how far he was miſled by truſting to that Author, and to adviſe him to ſet Things right in the next Edition of that great Work ?

I ſhall grant that *Caſaubon* wrote that Letter at K. *James*'s Deſire, and that he had his Information chiefly from him ; tho' at the ſame Time he acquaints us, that he had it from many others, Men of undoubted Veracity, and perfectly inſtructed in the Tranſactions of thoſe Times. It is true he does not name them, which this Author blames him for ; but that was no ways neceſſary in a Letter like this, eſpecially as they were ſo many : But the chief was the celebrated Sir *Robert Cotton*, to whoſe ineſtimable Collections all the Lovers of true and genuine Hiſtory are ſo vaſtly obliged. It was from them that learned and worthy Gentleman drew up Memoirs of our *Scottiſh* Affairs, and which (as they ſet that Part of our Hiſtory in a quite different Light from that in which *Buchanan* had repreſented it) were by K. *James*'s Order ſent to Preſident *de Thou*, with no other View than to undeceive that Author, and to free his Hiſtory from the many groſs Errors and Falſhoods which his too great Admiration of *Buchanan* had led him into. And if *Caſaubon* was perſuaded of this, (as his Letter ſhews he was) is he to be blamed for doing that which

is the Part of every good Man to do, *viz.* the ſetting him right that has gone aſtray?

To prove that *Caſaubon* was the *Sycophant* and *mercenary Tool* to K. *James*, which the Vindicator more than once calls him, in his P. 75. he brings another Letter of his to the ſame Preſident *de Thou*, wrote about two Months before the other above-mentioned, in which are theſe Words, *Hîc omnis mea induſtria, omnes vigiliæ in eo ſolo occupantur, ut regis voluntati ſatisfaciamus;* i. e. *All my Induſtry, all my Watchings,* [not, as this Author tranſlates it, *All my Thoughtfulneſs, all my Night Studies*] *are employed here in this one Thing, how I may ſatisfy the King's Will.* And is it not a fine Inference this Author draws from theſe Words, that the King employed *Iſaac Cauſabon* only or chiefly at that Time in contradicting *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory? When it appears from that and ſeveral other Letters writ by *Caſaubon* at that Juncture, (which this Author, in the following P. 76. ſeems to acknowledge) that the only Thing the King then employed him in, as he did alſo ſome of his own learned Subjects, was to confute the innumerable Books and Treatiſes publiſhed againſt him by the Bigots of the Church of *Rome*, particularly Cardinal *Bellarmine*'s Book *De poteſtate Papæ*, in which that Author exalts the Power of the Pope above all the Kings and Princes in the World, and maintains, that if they ſhould prove Hereticks, and oppoſe his abſolute and uncontroulable Dominion, he might abſolve their Subjects from their Allegiance, and impower them to dethrone and deſtroy their Sovereigns. Nay, theſe Popiſh Writers went yet farther, by maintaining, that all Church-men (be their Crimes what they would) were not to be called to Account for them by any Authority whatſoever, but that of their own ſpiritual Courts, as they called them: And yet theſe ſame wicked and Antichriſtian Doctrines were taught and put in Practice by our godly Reformers in *Scotland*, not only in the Reign of Q. *Mary*, but of her Son K. *James*, ſo long as he remained in it. Did they not then, and do not ſome of them ſtill, preach up the ſovereign Power of the People, to make and unmake

Kings

Kings at their Pleaſure, and to depoſe and cut them off for Mal-adminiſtration, of which they were the only proper Judges ? And did not they alſo, as I ſhewed before, plead the Exemption of the Clergy from all ſecular Juriſdiction ? It was againſt theſe Popiſh Principles that K. *James* employed *Caſaubon* and others then to write : And that he has done ſo to excellent Purpoſe, appears from the Writings publiſhed by him at that Time, *viz.* his long Letter to the learned Jeſuit *Fronto Ducæus*, his Treatiſe *De libertate eccleſiaſtica*, and his Animadverſions on Cardinal *Baronius*'s Annals. Theſe are all levelled againſt theſe groſs Errors and moſt wicked Practices of the *Romiſh* Church, and are the only controverſial Subjects that excellent Author has employed his Pen about. But as thoſe Principles are equally defended by the Zealots of the Presbyterian and of the Popiſh Party, I know not but it is upon that Account that *Caſaubon* is equally hated by both.

And yet, notwithſtanding theſe noble Tracts writ by *Caſaubon*, in Defence of the true Proteſtant Doctrines, this Author has the Confidence to accuſe him of Popery, and to tell us, P. 74. " that before he came over " to *England*, he was making great Advances towards it ;" and for this he vouches the Authority of *Peter du Moulin*, an high-flying *French* Miniſter, in a Letter of his to Dr. *Montague*, Biſhop of *Bath* and *Wells*. But what Ground had *du Moulin* for this ? No other but that *Caſaubon* and he differed much in their religious Sentiments. The former had a great Eſteem for the ancient Fathers, whom the latter, and moſt Presbyterians, generally have in great Contempt. The one was of Opinion that we ought not to depart farther from the Papiſts, than they have departed from the Doctrines of thoſe great Luminaries of the firſt and pureſt Ages of the Chriſtian Church. The other would admit nothing in Religion but what was agreeable to the *Geneva* Platform, and was, as it were, conſecrated by *Calvin* and *Beza*, and others that reformed upon their Plan. But this is the uſual Method of ſome Bigots, who, to make thoſe that differ from them odious to the People, load them with the hated Names

of

of Papiſts, Idolaters, and Limbs of Antichriſt. Thus they treated K. *James* and his Son K. *Charles* I. when it is well known to the whole World that there were not ſounder Proteſtants upon Earth than theſe Princes were. As to *Caſaubon*, how unjuſt theſe Accuſations of *du Moulin* were, appears from his own Epiſtles, No. 670, 743 and 744, but eſpecially from the Vindication of him by his learned and pious Son *Merick Caſaubon*, ſubjoined to the laſt Edition of his Father's Epiſtles, publiſhed by *Almeloveen*, *anno* 1709.

But is it not wonderful in this Pamphlet-writer, that he ſhould call the great *Caſaubon* a mercenary Hireling and Tool of K. *James*, and that, as I have ſhewed, moſt unjuſtly too? When he cannot but know that theſe Epithets do in a ſignal Manner belong to his Favourite *Buchanan*, who could ſacrifice his Reputation, and proſtiſtitute his moſt elegant Pen in Support of the worſt of Cauſes, and the greateſt Wickedneſs that, under a Mask of Religion, was ever perpetrated in any Nation. He can talk of the Penſion of 2000 Livres, which *Caſaubon* had for three or four Years from K. *James*; but overlooks theſe of far greater Value *Buchanan* had beſtowed upon him by his great Patrons the Earls of *Murray* and *Morton*, who thought they could not heap too many Favours upon him. By them, beſides other ſecret Bounties, he was made Director of the Chancery and Lord Privy Seal, with the Salaries and Perquiſites belonging to theſe honourable Offices; the ſecond of which, Perſons of the higheſt Rank do not now think it below them to accept of. And it is ſaid, that he had alſo a Penſion of 100 *l. Sterl.* from Q. *Elizabeth*, who play'd her own Game in the Confuſions which ſhe, in Conjunction with that Faction, had raiſed in this Kingdom.

I have done with the injurious Treatment this ill-natured Author has given to ſome of the moſt eminent Men of the two laſt Centuries, and that for no other Reaſon but becauſe they had not not the ſame fine Opinion of *Buchanan*, that he and that Author's other Admirers have taken up. I come now in the laſt Place to take Notice of the many frivolous Cavils and groundleſs

Reflexions, which (tho' foreign to his Purpose) the Vindicator passes upon myself. And,

1. In his P. 15. he brings a Passage from K. *James*'s *Basilicon Doron*, where dissuading his Son from reading *Buchanan*'s *libelli famosi*, he advises him, " to be a *Py-*
" *thagorean*, and to believe that the seditious Souls of
" those Writers pass into those who conceal their Books,
" and defend their Opinions (*a*). *The Vindicator* adds,
" Mr. *Ruddiman* puts his Thumb on this last Advice:
" An Advice indeed that the more ancient and wiser *So-*
" *lomon* the Son of *David* (*b*) would not have given his
" Son." Was ever any Thing more impertinent than this is? Where had I Occasion to mention that Advice? Or what should have moved me to conceal it, had it fallen in my Way? What K. *James* says is certainly true, that those who take Delight in reading seditious, atheistical, impious and obscene Books, Pamphlets, *&c.* may justly be said to be of the same Spirit that their Authors were of; for what is said of the *captus lectoris*, *i. e.* of the Reader's *Understanding*, is equally true of his *gustus*, or the Disposition of his *Heart*; and with the Alteration of the Word may be applied to him that common Verse,

Pro gustu lectoris habent sua fata libelli.

K. *James* confirms what he says in that Place, by the like Expressions in *Plato*, *Aristotle* and *Plutarch*, who have always been reckoned good and wise Men. Nay, what if it appear, that the wise *Solomon* himself gives the same Advice to every Man that K. *James* gives here to his Son? Does he not highly condemn those, Prov. xi. 14.

(*a*) This Railer against K. *James* ought at least to have given this Citation in his own Words, which are these: " In that Point I would
" have you a *Pythagorist*, to think that the very Spirits of these Arch-
" bellowses of Rebellion have made Transition in them that hoard
" their Books, or maintain their Opinions, *&c.*"

(*b*) This is an abominable Slander on Q. *Mary*, founded upon a most false and calumnious Reproach, that she was too familiar with *David Rizzio*, and that K. *James* (who was, for his great Piety, Wisdom and Learning, not unjustly called the *Solomon* of his Age, by all his Contemporaries, except those that were his mortal Enemies) might be the Product of their Amours. *What shall be given unto thee, thou false Tongue?*

xi. 14. *that delight in the Frowardneſs of the Wicked?* And iv. 14. he enjoins us, *Not to enter into the Paths of the Wicked, or to go into the Way of evil Men.* And, *v.* 14. *Put away from thee a froward Mouth, and perverſe Lips put far from thee.* And xvii. 4. he tells us, That *a wicked Doer giveth heed to falſe Lips, and a Liar giveth Ear to a naughty Tongue.* And *v.* 11. *An evil Man ſeeketh only Rebellion.* And *v.* 15. *That he that juſtifieth the Wicked, and he that condemneth the juſt, they both are an Abomination to the Lord.* And to quote no more, xxiv. 21. *My Son, fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to Change.* If then it can be proved that *Buchanan* was guilty of thoſe Things that K. *Solomon*, as well as K. *James*, condemn as wicked, and the latter particularly adviſes his Son to avoid; what ſhall we think of thoſe who take Delight in praiſing and defending his Writings, but that they are poſſeſt (as it were) with the ſame Spirit of Sedition, Falſe-ſpeaking and Detraction that was in him?

2. In his P. 16. becauſe I had ſaid that *Varillas* was *an Author not to be credited*, the Vindicator paſſes this rude and unmannerly Reflexion on me: "If Inconſiſtency, *ſays he*, be a ſure Criterion for ſuch a harſh Cenſure, Mr. *Ruddiman*, I doubt, will come off but badly himſelf; for which I refer the Reader to the Rev. Mr. *Logan*'s late Performance, *Mr. Ruddiman ſelf-condemned*." That *Varillas* was an Author *of no Credit* is acknowledged by the judicious Writers of his own Communion, and has (as I ſaid before) been demonſtrated by Bp. *Burnet*, in two Tracts he publiſhed in Confutation of the many groſs Errors he is guilty of in his Hiſtories. As for me, it is true that the Rev. Mr. *Logan* has muſtered up no fewer than one and twenty Inconſiſtencies that he pretends to have found in my Anſwer to him. But as that Author, in the fierce Attacks which he (without the leaſt Provocation on my Part) has made on me, in no leſs than ſix pretty large Treatiſes, has laid aſide all Regard, not only to common Decency, but alſo to clear and demonſtrative Truth, I had reſolved to give up (as they could anſwer

no

no End) all further Wranglings and Altercations with him. I thought it ſufficient, and perhaps more than ſufficient, that in a Preface to a Diſſertation I had writ, concerning the Competition for the Crown of *Scotland*, betwixt *Bruce* and *Baliol*, *anno* 1291, to take ſome Notice of the monſtrous Injuſtice of that Author, and to clear myſelf from ſome of thoſe many Inconſiſtencies he charges me with, not doubting but from that Specimen it would be eaſy to any Reader to form a Judgment of the reſt. But now, that the Vindicator will needs bring thoſe pretended Inconſiſtencies into the Field again, all I ſhall at preſent ſay of them is, that I am willing to ſubmit the whole Matter to ſuch Arbiters as either the Vindicator or Mr. *Logan* himſelf ſhall chooſe, provided they are Perſons of common Senſe and common Honeſty; and that, if they ſhall find me guilty of ſo much as one of thoſe Inconſiſtencies, I am content to be lookt upon as a Perſon of no Character, and (which is the worſt that can be ſaid of me as a Writer) that I am leſs to be credited than Mr. *Logan* himſelf.

3. The Vindicator, in his P. 29. is angry with *David Buchanan*, and will hardly allow him to be called his Favourite's Couſin, for *making ſo free with his Character*, (for ſo he expreſſes it) in theſe Words, *Erat auſtero ſupercilio & toto corporis habitu (imò moribus hic noſter) ſubagreſtis*. But this is brought in, to give me another Wipe: For, *ſays he*, "Now when Mr. *Ruddiman* comes "to repeat this Character of the great Man, whoſe Life "he is deſcribing, he leaves out this Part, *Imò moribus* "*hic noſter, ſubagreſtis ſc.* (*a*)." If this is a Reflexion upon *Buchanan*, he ſhould rather have thanked than blamed me for leaving it out. But where do I leave it out? Not among the Teſtimonies of learned Men concerning him; for theſe Words of *David Buchanan* are there

E with

(*a*) I obſerve here by the bye, that theſe Words of *David Buchanan*, in which he gives ſuch a particular Deſcription of the *Auſterity of his Aſpect*, and the *Ruſticity of his Manners*, renders it very probable that he had ſeen Mr. *George Buchanan* himſelf, and conſequently that he might have been a Witneſs of that his Repentance, which the Lady *Roſſyth* in Mr. *Sage*'s Letter ſpeaks of; notwithſtanding all that the Vindicator has ſaid to the contrary.

with the reſt (which I had from Sir *Robert Sibbald, in vita Buch.*) inſerted in my Preface, P. 14. But I omit them when I am ſpeaking of *Buchanan*'s Manner of Life. And was I obliged to ſet down every Thing *David Buchanan* ſays of him, when theſe I have mentioned were ſufficient for the Purpoſe I was then upon ?

But the Vindicator adds, " That I have inſerted an-
" other, which he wiſhes I had forbore, *Auſtero fuiſſe*
" *ſupercilio* (*quod & ipſius imagines adhuc præferunt*).
It is very odd that this Author ſhould quarrel me for inſerting a Thing which he himſelf, in the very next Page, owns to be true, that the Pictures of *Buchanan* ſhew him to have been of an *auſtere Countenance*, and makes this Apology for it, *that theſe Pictures ſeem to have been taken of him ſome ſhort Time before his Death.* How truly this is ſaid, I ſhall not now enquire.

But the beſt of all is, the Senſe he puts upon the Words of *David Buchanan* ; who, whether he was the other's Couſin or not, was (as Bp. *Nicolſon, Scot. Hiſtor. Library, P.* 119. juſtly obſerves) *a Man much after his own Heart, and as deſirous as may be to cover all the Faults in him that are capable of Shelter.* This Author, that his Favourite may be without any Blemiſh, and abſolutely perfect in Body as well as Mind, renders the Words, *auſtero ſupercilio*, by *a reſerved Gravity in* Buchanan's *Looks*. But it is ſurely more natural to think, that the other *Buchanan* meant ſomething elſe by theſe Words, *viz.* that there appeared ſomething *grim, ſtern* and *harſh* in his *Aſpect*, which, without much Diſparagement to him, (as the Vindicator himſelf allows) might be true of an old Man, labouring under continual Diſeaſes. And this is agreeable to what Dr. *Smith* ſays of him, that he was *extremo tempore moribus paulò aſperioribus, & ingenio nonnihil tetrico ac minùs tractabili.*

But the other Part that *Dav. Buchanan* gives of his Nameſake's Character, this Author cannot away with, and puts ſuch a Senſe on it as I am perſuaded his Friend never meant, by tranſlating the Words, *moribus ſubagreſtis*, that *Buchanan* was *ſomewhat ruſtick and coarſe in his Morals* ; *which*, ſays he, *is certainly falſe* ;

and

and brings a Paſſage from Sir *James Melvil*, to ſhew the contrary, who ſays, *that he was pleaſant in Converſation, rehearſing at all Occaſions Moralities ſhort and inſtructive.* *Ruſtick* or *coarſe* in *Morals* is a Phraſe I am not acquainted with. I thought that by theſe two *Latin* Words nothing more was to be underſtood, but that *Buchanan* was ſomewhat ruſtick or clowniſh in his outward Behaviour and Addreſs, and not that they were to be referred to what we call *Morality*, or the inward Diſpoſition of the Soul. And this, tho' it may have ſomething that is diſagreeable in it, yet it is far from being a Fault, and no more than what many good and learned Men have been, and ſtill are liable to.

And here, by the bye, tho' I am not concerned in the Matter, I cannot but take Notice of another Part of the Character given to that great Man (for ſo I ſhall ſtill allow him in ſome Reſpects to have been) by *David Buchanan*, that he was *toto corporis habitu ſubagreſtis.* Theſe Words the Vindicator renders, *ſomewhat ruſtick or Stoical in his Dreſs*; and tho' at firſt he excuſes it, by ſaying, *As to his Dreſs, that may be owing to his being a Batchelor all his Life*, (which Apology however is a Point will not be eaſily granted him) yet he will not allow it to be true of *Buchanan*, for he adds, *that* Buchanan *was a moſt facetious and agreeable Man in Converſation.* But what has *Facetiouſneſs* to do with *Dreſs?* For what ſhould hinder a Man to be very *chearful* and *entertaining in Converſation*, who is *negligent* and *careleſs* in his *Dreſs* or *Apparel* (*a*)? But how does our Author diſprove that *Ruſticity* which is here aſcribed to *Buchanan?* Why, by the Words of *Adr. Turnebus*, which the Vindicator thus tranſlates: *He does not think there was a polite Man in* France, *who was not of* George Buchanan's *Acquaintance.* *Turnebus*'s Words are: *Neminem eſſe exiſtimo in Gallia paulo humaniorem, cui non ſit notus Georgius Buchanus, non ſolùm eximius Poëta, verùm etiam vir omni liberali eruditione, non leviter tinctus, ſed penitus imbu-*

 tus:

(*a*) What *Horace* ſays of one in his Time, may be applied to *Buchanan*, —*Ingenium ingens Inculto latet hoc ſub corpore.*

tus : Where, by the Words *paulo humaniorem*, I ſuppoſe every Body skilled in *Latin* will agree with me, that nothing elſe is meant, but that there was none in *France* that was *tolerably verſed in the* Belles Lettres, *or polite Learning*, (which is ſtill called the Study of *Humanity*) *to whom* George Buchanan *was not known*, &c. But might not that be true, whether *Buchanan* was either ruſtick or genteel in his Dreſs, or not ? Had the Vindicator cited the above Words of Sir *James Melvil*, that *Buchanan* was *pleaſant in Converſation*, that might have taken off ſomething of the *Ruſticity* of his *Manners*, but not of his *Negligence* in *Dreſs*. But he ſhould have added what Sir *James* ſays further of him, that he was *a Stoick Philoſopher*, which Epithet this Author has above, not over juſtly, applied to *Buchanan*'s *Dreſs* ; for that was far from being true of the *Stoicks* in general, and could only be ſaid of that Sect or Subdiviſion of them, who were called *Cynicks*, as *Diogenes*, *Antiſthenes*, and others, who oft-times philoſophized naked, or without any Dreſs at all. I hope *Buchanan* was none of theſe.

4. In P. 31. he obſerves, that in my Notes on *Buchanan*'s Life, P. 12. " I repreſent *Buchanan* as a very vir-
" tuous and religious Perſon ; but that in P. 10. I quar-
" rel him for the Rage and Fury with which he inveighs
" againſt thoſe that favoured the exil'd Queen, and par-
" ticularly the illuſtrious Family of *Hamilton*, *and add*,
" that I am ſorry for it, as well for *Buchanan*'s, as for
" that Family's Sake." I confeſs that when I wrote theſe Notes, I had a better Opinion of *Buchanan* than I now have ; for then I charitably thought that *Buchanan* had ſuffered himſelf to be impoſed upon, and that he verily believed all the ill Things he wrote of Q. *Mary* to be true ; which alſo was the Caſe with *Spotſwood* the Superintendent, Preſident *de Thou*, and many others : But now, I am ſorry to ſay it, that I have but too much Ground to think *Buchanan* himſelf was engaged in the Plot, and that he knew that a great many of thoſe Things which he relates of that unfortunate Queen were falſe ; particularly that he was privy to the forging of thoſe abominable Letters that were given out to be written by

the

the Queen to *Bothwel*; which, tho' ſworn to by *Murray*, *Morton*, the Lord *Lindſay*, and theſe two fine Churchmen the Bp. of *Orkney*, and the Commendatar of *Dumfermline*, can now be demonſtrated to have been all hatched and contrived by themſelves. But here the Vindicator thinks to bring me in ſaying Things that are incompatible, that *Buchanan* ſhould rail againſt others, and yet be a religious Man himſelf: "Mr. *Ruddiman, ſays he*, can beſt explain "how he came to hit upon ſuch inconſiſtent Characters, "and which viſibly deſtroy one another." But what if I tell this Author, that it more concerns him, who has *Buchanan*'s Credit ſo much at Heart, to reconcile theſe ſeeming Inconſiſtencies, than it does me? That bitter Revilings and Railings againſt either Perſons or Families, are contrary to the Spirit and Commands of the Goſpel, is what none acquainted with the ſacred Writings can doubt: And yet it is no leſs true, that *Buchanan*'s Invective againſt the Family of *Hamilton* (not to ſpeak of his other Writings of that Kind) is full of the moſt outragious Reproaches and foul Language that are to be found any where. But if this is a Sin of ſo deep a Dye, that whoever is guilty of it cannot be deemed a good and pious Chriſtian, then indeed *Buchanan* muſt loſe that good Character I have given of him; and ſo muſt many hundreds, nay thouſands, more, whom the World has hitherto thought to have been truly virtuous and religious Perſons. For, not to mention others, what more opprobrious Language is to be found in any Writings, than in thoſe of our firſt Reformers, *Luther*, *Calvin* (*a*), *Beza*, *Knox*,

(*a*) A ſingular Inſtance we have of human Frailty, even in the greateſt of Men, in this Mr. *Calvin*; who, tho' otherwiſe an admirable Perſon, and a prime Inſtrument of bringing about the Reformation of the Church; yet ſuffered himſelf to be tranſported into ſuch Rage and Fury againſt thoſe whoſe religious Sentiments were different from his own, as has given but too juſt Offence to many good and pious Men. Witneſs, among others, two Tracts publiſhed by him, the one againſt an eminent Lawyer *Franc. Balduin*; the other againſt the truly religious, as well as learned *Sebaſtian Caſtalio*. There are three Things highly blameable in Mr. *Calvin*'s Conduct towards thoſe worthy Men: 1*ſt*, That he miſtook them for being Authors of the Books or Papers that gave him Of-

Knox, &c. and, on the contrary, in the Works of Popiſh and other Authors who have wrote againſt them? But it would be hard and uncharitable to think that either the one or the other were Perſons that had no Senſe of God and true Piety upon their Minds: Nay ſo far from it, that it was their paſſionate Zeal for what was on both Sides thought to be the true Religion, which made them break forth into ſuch furious Rage againſt one another. But ſince *the Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteouſneſs of God*, as the meek and bleſſed St. *James* tells us, and that many good Men (*a*) have declared themſelves much of-

Offence, the former having been wrote, not by *Balduin*, as he imagined, but by *Geo. Caſſander*, a Perſon no leſs famous for his great Learning, than for his moderate and pacifick Temper in treating of the Theological Diſputes of thoſe Times. And as to the latter, we are aſſured by *Caſtalio* himſelf, that he knew nothing of it, nor had the leaſt Hand in its Compoſure. 2. The ſecond Thing which good Men find Fault with in Mr. *Calvin*, is that Train of foul and opprobrious Language with which he attacks thoſe whom he fancied to be his Adverſaries, and which, tho' his Accuſations had been true, were not ſuitable to that Spirit of Meekneſs and Charity which the Goſpel enjoins. 3. But the worſt of all is, that the Things he charged both the one and the other with, were falſe and calumnious, as was proved by the Anſwers publiſhed by them, as well as *Caſſander*, in their own Vindication. That theſe are Blemiſhes in that great Man's Character cannot, I think, be denied; but far be it from me, that I ſhould therefore believe that he was not all the while a moſt ſincere and pious Chriſtian. In the mean time, it is Matter both of Wonder and Regret, that Church-men, above thoſe of all other Profeſſions, ſhould be moſt outragious in their Diſputes with one another; and that we ſhould have Reaſon to cry out with the Poet!

——— ——— *Tantæne animis cæleſtibus iræ?*

If theſe Things will not reconcile what I have ſaid of *Buchanan*, no Truth can conſiſt with another.

(*a*) Here I cannot omit obſerving, that Abp. *Spotſwood*, after the high Commendation he gives of the Piety and other rare Gifts of the famous Mr. *Knox*, yet among other Arguments he brings to prove him not to have been the Author of the Hiſtory that goes under his Name, he has theſe remarkable Words: "As to the Hiſtory of the Church, "aſcribed commonly to him, the ſame was not his Work, but his "Name ſuppoſed to gain it Credit; for beſides the ſcurril Diſcourſes "we find in it, more fitting a Comedian on a Stage than a Divine or "Miniſter, as Mr. *Knox* was, and the ſpiteful Malice that Author ex-"preſſeth againſt the Queen Regent;" [*Then he mentions another Ground for his not believing it to be his*, viz. *a Paſſage in it taken out of* Fox's *Martyrology, which was foiſted into it by* David Buchanan] *and then he adds*, "A greater Injury could not have been done to the Fame of that wor-"thy Man, than to father upon him the ridiculous Toyes and malici-

"ous

offended with the bitter Railings that are to be found in the Writings of the great Men above-named, why might not I expreſs myſelf ſorry that *Buchanan* ſhould have been guilty of it in that ſpiteful Satyr of his againſt the firſt Family (next to that of the Sovereign) in this Kingdom; without impeaching his otherwiſe religious Diſpoſition? Tho', I confeſs, the Opinion I now have of him, on that Score, is not altogether ſo favourable as it was then.

5. The Vindicator thinks he has made a mighty Diſcovery, that he has catched me in a Miſtake in Figures; that in my Preface to Mr. *Anderſon*'s *Diplomata* I ſay that *James* VI. took upon him the Adminiſtration of the Government, 15. *Feb.* 1578, but that in my Note on *Buchanani epiſtolæ, &c.* No. 28. I ſay it was on 8th *March* 1579. I own it to be an Error, and that what I have ſaid in one Place diſagrees with what I have ſaid in another. But it is an Error in Cyphers, (whether by my own Fault, or that of the Printer, is not material;) and every Body knows that there is nothing more common in Writing or Printing than ſuch Eſcapes as theſe; of which I could ſhew him innumerable Examples in the beſt Authors, and in none more than in his own *Buchanan* and Mr. *Logan*. Nay, of this the Pamphleteer himſelf gives us ſome Inſtances vaſtly more groſs than mine is, in his P. 65. of which afterwards. This Author, however, to make this Accuſation leave the deeper Sting, brings a Sentence from *Cicero*, *Nihil turpius quàm quòd in ſcriptis obliviſceretur, quod paulo antè poſuiſſet.* But, beſides that *Cicero* is there ſpeaking of Things, and not of Dates, how will his *paulo antè* agree with me, when no fewer than 24 Years interveened between the writing the one

" ous Detractions contained in that Book. But this ſhall ſerve for his " clearing in that Particular." Thus he: And yet after all, the good Archbiſhop was egregiouſly miſtaken; for all that ſcurrilous Diſcourſe, and theſe malicious Detractions are to be found in the firſt Edition, which was printed, without any Interpolations, ſoon after *Knox*'s Death, and more fully in that which was lately publiſhed by Mr. *Matthew Crawfurd*, from the Author's original MS. now in the Library of the Univerſity of *Glaſgow*. ***I leave it to the Vindicator himſelf to make the Application.***

one and the other of the two Paſſages above-mentioned, *viz.* the former in the Year 1715, and the latter in 1739; the one towards the End of one Book, and the other in the Preface to another. This the Vindicator ſeems ſenſible of himſelf, by adding, " Tho' *this were not the* " *Caſe*, it ought to convince Mr. *Ruddiman* however, that " *Buchanan* deſerved better Quarters than he met with " from him for ſuch Eſcapes, ſome of which were not ſo " groſs as this." The Errors I find Fault with in *Buchanan* are chiefly ſuch as are momentous, as relating to Matters of Fact, which he, to ſerve the Ends of a wicked Party, has moſt groſly miſrepreſented. As for his Errors in Chronology, ſuch as that of mine is, which are innumerable, I do not reproach him for them, as this Author here does me, but ſimply point out and rectify them; and I aſſure myſelf every Lover of true Hiſtory will commend me for ſo doing. And the Vindicator will here forgive me that I mention a very odd one in that Author, and worſe than that of mine, *viz.* that he makes his great Patron the Earl of *Murray* to have been killed in the Year 1571, when we are ſure, from the publick Records and otherwiſe, that that happened two Years before, according to the then Computation, and one Year before that now in Uſe with us (*a*).

6. A little before this, the Vindicator, ſpeaking of *Buchanan*'s Dialogue *de jure regni*, ſays, " That it is " obſervable, that if this Dialogue had contained ſuch " diſobliging Things, or ſo unacceptable to the Court, " as Mr. *Ruddiman* alledges, *Buchanan* would not have " adventured the dedicating of it to the King; at leaſt " that it would not have been licenſed with his Royal Privi- " lege; and that not in his Minority, but probably ſoon af- " ter his Majeſty had taken upon himſelf the Adminiſtrati- " on of the Government." But this Author will allow me to ſet Things right. Upon a more ſtrict Search into the publick

(*a*) I will add another yet worſe, in the Vindicator's Friend Mr. *Logan*, who, in the very Title-page of his ſecond Letter to me, concerning Mr. *Alexander Henderſon*, makes that famous Man to have died *anno* 1647, tho' in ſome Parts of that Letter he writes that he died *anno* 1646, which the Inſcription on his Monument ſhews to be true.

blick Records, I find that K. *James* took the Adminiſtration of the Government into his own Hands on 8th *March* 1577, according to the old *Scottiſh* and the preſent *Engliſh* Computation ; but, according to that now in Uſe with us, 1578 ; *i. e.* when that King (who was born 19th *June* 1566) wanted three Months and 11 Days of being 12 Years of Age. Again, *Buchanan* dedicates his *Dialogue* to K. *James* 10th *January* 1578-9, *i. e.* when he was 12 Years, ſix Months, and nine Days old. How then comes this Author to ſay, that *Buchanan*'s Dialogue, with the Royal Licence, *was not publiſhed in K.* James's *Minority*, but probably after it (as his Words manifeſtly bear) ; when it appears that he then wanted a whole Year and ſeveral Months to compleat his *Pupillarity ?* Nay, further, when *Buchanan*'s Dialogue and Hiſtory were condemned by an Act of Parliament, which ſat in *May* 1584, K. *James* was not full 18 Years of Age. This Author, P. 40. calls this a *pack't Parliament*, and ſo will all Parliaments be to him and his Friend Mr. *Logan*, which paſs Acts that do not pleaſe them. He then adds, " That it is a Rub on his Majeſty, that he ſhould condemn " a Book which was before licenſed by his Authority." But he here conceals, that when that Licence was granted, K. *James* was not, as I ſaid, 12 Years and an half old ; and that tho' he had got rid of the E. of *Morton*, who had laid down his Regency the Year before, yet he had ſtill but too many of the Party about him, who had been acceſſory to the dethroning of his Mother, and who could eaſily get him to licenſe a Book, which was calculated for juſtifying all their Proceedings. Beſides, as it was writ by his own *Preceptor*, he could not but readily think that it was deſigned for his *Inſtruction* : When it is viſible to all ſober and thinking Men, that it has a natural Tendency to the *Deſtruction* of all Kings and Kingly Government.

7. But as this famous Dialogue is Mr. *Logan*'s and this Author's *political Creed*, and the only true Model of all Civil Government, there is nothing offends him ſo much as that this his *Dagon* ſhould be reproached ; and it is with him a Kind of Blaſphemy in me to have ſpoke diſ-

reſpectfully of it, for that is all I am guilty of. And therefore in his P. 43. he falls foul upon " *Winzet*, *Black-*
" *wood*, *Barclay*, and others of the Papiſtical Crew, (*as*
" *he calls them*) who after *Buchanan*'s Death wrote a-
" gainſt his Dialogue, and pretended to give a Confuta-
" tion of it. But their Anſwers, *adds he*, periſhed with
" themſelves, and the Dialogue, like a ſtrong Fortreſs,
" ſtands as yet impregnable." Theſe are lofty Words, and uttered with an equal Degree of Aſſurance. But why does he brand thoſe Authors he has mentioned with the contemptuous Name of a *Papiſtical Crew*, when he cannot but know that what they condemn in *Buchanan*, is maintained by the moſt flaming Zealots of that Church (*a*)? They were all Perſons of conſiderable Rank in the World, and no leſs eminent for their great Learning as well as Probity. The firſt, *Ninian Winzet*, was, for his ſingular Piety, in his Way, made Abbot of the *Scottiſh* Monaſtery at *Ratisbon*. The ſecond, *Adam Blackwood*, was deſcended of an ancient and honourable Family in *Scotland*, and, for his extraordinary Abilities as a Lawyer, choſen one of the Senators in the Preſidial Court of *Poictiers* in *France*. But the moſt conſiderable of all the three, as to that Matter, is *William Barclay*, a *Scottiſh* Gentleman, and nearly related to ſome of the beſt Families of this Kingdom. He was alſo a great Lawyer; and as he is highly to be commended for the ſolid Confutation of the wild Principles of *Buchanan*, *Jun. Brutus*, *Bou-*

(*a*) Dr. *Brady*, in the Beginning of his *true Hiſtory of the Succeſſion of the Crown of* England, gives a ſhort Account of theſe *Popiſh Writers* who maintain the ſame Doctrine that *Buchanan* does in his Dialogue; the principal of whom are, (1.) *Joannes de Pariſiis*, who flouriſhed *anno* 1246. (2.) *Marſilius Patavinus*, who publiſhed a Tract *de tranſlatione imperii*, in the Time of the Emperor *Lewis* of *Bavaria*. (3.) *Jacob Almain*, a Doctor of Divinity, and Schoolman, who wrote a Tract *de poteſtate eccleſiaſtica*, anno 1512. (4.) *Dominicus Soto*, a Dominican Friar, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Salamanca*, in his Book *de juſtitia*, *lib.* 5. printed *anno* 1556. (5.) *Franc. Feverdentius*. (6.) *Gal. Eſtius*, &c. To whom add the whole Society of *Jeſuits*, as *Suarez*, *Leonardus Leſſius*, *Lud. Molina*, *Adam Tanner*, *Joh. Mariana*, *Rob. Bellarmine*, Father *Parſons*, &c. It is therefore moſt unreaſonable in this Author to call them a *Papiſtical Crew*, who, tho' of that Church's Communion, had the Courage to oppoſe one of the moſt wicked and miſchievous of its Errors.

Boucherius, and other *Monarchomachi*, as he calls them; ſo eſpecially for this, that no Proteſtant has more ſtrenuouſly aſſerted the Cauſe of both Chriſtian Princes and People, againſt Papal Tyranny and Domination, than he has done; in which he was alſo ſeconded by his moſt worthy Son the never enough celebrated *John Barclay*, tho' both lived and died in the Popiſh Communion. It is intolerable in this Author to ſay, that their Anſwers to *Buchanan*'s Dialogue *periſhed with themſelves*, when their Writings are ſtill extant, and thoſe of the two laſt have undergone ſeveral Impreſſions, and will be held in high Eſteem, while Letters and juſt Principles are regarded; when ſuch pitiful Defenders of *Buchanan*'s Dialogue ſhall be quite forgotten. Neither is it true, what this Author writes, that thoſe Anſwers did not come abroad till after *Buchanan*'s Death. He himſelf indeed, as this Author obſerves, P. 35. tells us, *that he had heard that a Confutation of that his Dialogue was deſigned by ſome Perſon in* Scotland, *and wiſhes that it might be publiſhed while he himſelf was alive*. And he had his Wiſh accompliſhed: For *Blackwood*'s Confutation of it came out in the Year 1581; the Dedication of that Treatiſe to Q. *Mary* and her Son K. *James* bearing Date 28th *Sept.* 1580, juſt two Years before *Buchanan*'s Death.

The triumphant Manner in which this great Admirer of that Dialogue proceeds is ſo remarkable, that I cannot forbear ſetting down his Words, " Mr. *Ruddiman*, " *ſays he*, tells us, he did not adventure the attacking " this Fortreſs: *In cauſæ, quod dicitur, arcem nunquam* " *invadimus*, that is, he did not formally lay Siege to " it. But as true it is, that he hath been nibbling at " the ſapping its Foundation every where, in his Notes " on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory. The *Congreſſus*, in *Gordon* " of *Straloch*'s Opinion at leaſt, and others of his Stamp, " might have appeared not ſo very *impar*, the Fortreſs " being built by one old Schoolmaſter, and attempted to " be pulled down by another." What a ſtrange Rant have we here! As it would have been very improper, in a Preface, to have entered upon that Argument, ſo I no where in the leaſt meddle with it. What this Author

calls my *nibbling at the ſapping of the Foundation* of that famous Dialogue, in my Notes on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory, amounts to no more than this, that in theſe Notes, and elſewhere, when there was Occaſion for it, I do not ſtand to condemn all Seditions, Inſurrections and Rebellions of Subjects againſt their lawful Sovereigns, which that Dialogue manifeſtly juſtifies and patronizes. And if that is a *nibbling at ſapping its Foundation*, I frankly own it, and ſhall never be aſhamed of it.

But the following Words of this *Bravo* crown all the reſt: "However, I own, *ſays he*, Mr. *Ruddiman* was "ſo much the wiſer, in not making his Approaches but at "a great Diſtance; for he might have got his Fingers "burnt, or been ſtifled in the firſt Attack." But was Mr. *Ruddiman* really in ſo great Danger, and was it ſo formidable a Thing for him to have made near Approaches to that Fortreſs, as he calls it, that if he had approached too near it, it would have ſtifled or cruſh'd him to Death at the firſt Attack? As for a Fortreſs's burning one's Fingers, whatever Elegancy this Author may think is in that Way of ſpeaking, I doubt he will find ſome Difficulty before he can get it introduced into the *Engliſh* Language (*a*). But, to be ſerious, Was it more dangerous to me, had I ſo inclined, to attack *Buchanan*'s Dialogue, than it was to the greateſt Divines and Lawyers that that or any other Age have produced, who have either directly or indirectly, not only *attacked*, but utterly *demoliſhed* that *Fortreſs*, and have rendred it ſuperfluous in me, or any other, again (to uſe this Author's Phraſe) *to lay Siege to it?* They were ſuch as theſe that *Gordon* of *Straloch* ſays ought to have been

(*a*) This Author ought to have been aware of this, before he took upon him to correct the Language of others; as particularly when he condemns the Word *vamp* in Mr. *Sage* and Bp. *Keith*, which he in a Note, P. 46. ſays is not *Engliſh*; but he will allow me to tell him that it is to be found in good *Engliſh* Writers, and his Dictionaries will teach him, that it ſignifies to *mend or furbiſh up*. But in this he would needs imitate his Friend Mr. *Logan*, who, in his *Finiſhing Stroke*, Part 1. P. 142. blames me for ſaying that the E. of *Douglas*'s *Suit was ungrateful to all*, when there is not a more proper Phraſe in the *Engliſh* Language than that is.

been employed in treating of that Matter, for which in his Opinion *Buchanan* was no ways qualified. And ſuch, bleſſed be God, have appeared in that Cauſe : For, not to mention the innumerable Treatiſes and Diſcourſes publiſhed againſt the miſchievous Doctrines and Principles maintained in that Dialogue, by the moſt eminent Divines in this and other Countries, has it not been ſolidly confuted, and the pernicious Conſequences of it demonſtratively laid open by the greateſt Lawyers of our own Kingdom, not only by *Blackwood* and *Barclay*, whom *Straloch* names, but alſo by Sir *Lewis Stewart*, and Sir *Geo. Mackenzie* : To whom I might add the great Sir *Thomas Craig*, who, tho' he does not mention *Buchanan*, yet more than once condemns his Principles ? But what are all theſe (will the Vindicator ſay) to the matchleſs *Buchanan ?* For in his Opinion,

Οἷος πέπνυται, τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσιν.

Hic ſolus ſapiens, alii volitant ſicut umbræ.

8. He next brings into the Field, and me with it, a Paſſage in the Life of Cardinal *Laurea*, writ by his Creature, one *Roger Crichton*, [not *Ruggerius Tritonius*, as the Vindicator calls him] Abbot of *Pignerol*. This Paſſage was firſt greedily ſnatched at by Bp. *Burnet*, in the 3d Volume of his Hiſtory of the Reformation, and now with no leſs Fondneſs laid hold on by this Author, as a Confirmation, in his Conceit, of all the vile Things related by *Buchanan* of Q. *Mary*. It is not here material to repeat what is ſaid of her by that *Crichton*, ſince it can be evinced that the foul Aſperſions thrown upon that Queen's Memory by that Author, whenceſoever he had them, are all ſcandalous Falſhoods and Lies, firſt invented, and afterwards induſtriouſly propagated by her moſt malicious and implacable Enemies. The Vindicator, that he might fetch a Stroke at me, mentions an Objection I had made to that Author's Teſtimony ; which being only a mere Conjecture, he might have ſeen that I laid

laid but ſmall Streſs upon it (*a*). But he has thought fit to paſs over the other and more momentous Reaſons, (which I have ſet down before in that very Place of my Preface) that might have induced that Cardinal, or this Writer of his Life, to entertain at that Time a bad Opinion both of the Virtue and Religion of that Princeſs, and conſequently to believe all the wicked Reports that were ſpread of her. But theſe Calumnies being all removed (as I there ſay) by thoſe that had much better Opportunity of knowing *Scottiſh* Affairs than thoſe Strangers could poſſibly have, there is no Need for me to inſiſt further on their Teſtimony. One Thing however I ſhall here mention, which very much weakens, if not quite deſtroys, the Credit of that Biographer, *viz.* That Cardinal *Laurea* had in his Hands a Teſtament of Q. *Mary*, writ, ſays he, the very Night before ſhe was beheaded, and which he himſelf cauſed be delivered to *Philip* II. King of *Spain*; in which, forſooth, ſhe is ſaid to have bequeathed the Crown of *England* and *Scotland* (*b*) to that King, if her Son K. *James* ſhould not renounce what was then called Hereſy. This Story, among many others, was trumped up by Q. *Elizabeth*, that ſhe might engage K. *James* to join the more heartily with her in oppoſing the formidable Preparations then making by the King of *Spain* to invade *England*, and eſpecially to render K. *James* the more indifferent about his Mother, (who had thus, as Q. *Elizabeth* gave out, diſinherited him) whoſe Death was then projected by

(*a*) My Words are, *Poterit etiam Laureus ob tot moras injectas paullo irritatior exiſtimari*, i. e. "It may alſo be thought that the many Stops "Q. *Mary* had put to his coming to *Scotland*, had ſomewhat provoked "that Cardinal to entertain a bad Opinion of Q. *Mary*, eſpecially as "ſhe had at that Time married a Proteſtant, which could not fail to "daſh all the Hopes he had of reſtoring the Popiſh Religion in this "Kingdom."

(*b*) *Crichton* names only the Crown of *England*, as if Q. *Mary* could be ſuppoſed to act ſo abſurdly as to think ſhe could by a Deed of hers give away that Crown ſhe was not poſſeſt of to whom ſhe pleaſed, and that (for the ſame Reaſon that ſhe took upon her to diſpoſe of the Crown of *England*) ſhe would not do the like with that of *Scotland*. See more of this, in *de Thou*, *hiſt. lib.* 86. *Spotſwood*, P. 353, and 354. but eſpecially in Dr. *Mackenzie*'s *Scots* Writers, Vol. 3. P. 403, &c.

by that Queen and her Miniſters. But how not only falſe but ridiculous that pretended Teſtament was, appears by the real Teſtament, writ by Q. *Mary*'s own Hand the Day before her barbarous Execution. The Original of this Teſtament is yet preſerved in the *Scots* College at *Paris*; which alſo her Executors cauſed be printed within two Years thereafter; a Copy whereof is in the Advocate's Library. The Falſhood of that other pretended Teſtament is further confirmed from this, that that King of *Spain* did never make a Handle of it for claiming the Crown of *Scotland*; but alſo, and more particularly, from the dying Words of that heroick Princeſs, when ſhe was ſtepping forth to the *Scaffold*, where ſhe was to lay down her Head, to her truſty Servant, and Steward of her Houſhold, *Andrew Melvil*: *Commend me*, ſaid ſhe, *to my Son, and tell him, that I have not done any Thing prejudicial to the State and Kingdom of* Scotland (*a*).

Theſe are all the Things, ſo far as I can obſerve, wherein this Author diſcovers his Good-will towards me in the firſt Part of his Vindication. I come now to his ſecond Part, in which he gives me ſome more Inſtances of the like Benevolence.

II. *Of*

(*a*) Bp. *Burnet* acknowledges that there are ſome Things wrong in *Crichton*'s Relation. Tho' he does not name them, I will mention one, and that becauſe this Author thinks it makes much for his Purpoſe. The Words, as the Bp. tranſlates them, are thoſe: "Being asked [*by* "*the Queen*] why they [*of the Nobility*, &c.] came thither armed; "they anſwered, they came only to puniſh *Bothwel* for the Crimes "committed by him, both in the baſe and cruel Murder of the King, "and on the Force he had put on her Perſon. The Queen juſtified "*Bothwel*, and ſaid he had done nothing without her Conſent. This "did provoke their Indignation to ſuch a Degree, that they cried all "out with one Voice, *Then, Madam, you ſhall be our Priſoner.*" From theſe Words the Vindicator, P. 53. would infer, that the Queen gave her Conſent not only to her Marriage with *Bothwel*, but alſo to his murdering of her Husband. But can there be any Thing more abſurd than this, that the Queen ſhould be ſo monſtrouſly fooliſh as to own, when in her Enemies Hands, that ſhe gave her Conſent to that Murder, which, tho' it had been true, it was infinitely her Wiſdom to conceal? *Buchanan*, for all his Malice againſt her, had more Senſe than to affirm this of her.

II. *Of* Buchanan's *Ingratitude.*

AS Ingratitude has always been reckoned one of the blackeſt Crimes a Man can be guilty of, and as this vaſt Admirer of *Buchanan* will not allow any Tache to ly on his Memory, he had all the Reaſon in the World to purge him, if poſſible, from that moſt foul and infamous Blot. And to do the Vindicator Juſtice, he has been at no ſmall Pains, ſo far as he was able, to wipe it off. How well he has ſucceeded, is what I am next to take under Conſideration.

And here in the firſt Place, it grates him not a little, that ſo many (ſome of whom he names) ſhould have loaded *Buchanan* with the Reproach of *Ingratitude*. But he had no Reaſon to bring me, as he moſt unjuſtly does, into the Number: For in the ſeveral Paſſages he brings from my Writings, there is not one in which the Word *ingrate* or *Ingratitude*, as applied to *Buchanan*, is to be found. In my Notes indeed on his Life, I mention two Favours he had received from Q. *Mary*; and if he made unworthy Returns for them, the Conſequence is unavoidable, tho' I do not expreſs it, that *Buchanan* was guilty of Ingratitude to that Queen. The firſt of thoſe Favours was, his having been pitched upon by her for *Preceptor* to her Son, before he was yet born, with a Salary no doubt deſigned him ſuitable to ſuch a high and honourable Employment. The ſecond Favour I mention was, that by the ſame Queen he was appointed one of the Profeſſors, or rather chief Maſter of *St. Leonard*'s College in the Univerſity of *St. Andrews*.

The former of theſe Favours is plainly intimated by *Buchanan* himſelf, in the laſt Words of his Life, written by him two Years before his Death. *In præſentia*, ſays he, *ſeptuageſimum quartum annum agens, apud Jacobum ſextum Scotorum regem, cui erudiendo erat præfectus anno milleſimo quingenteſimo ſexageſimo quinto, ſenectutis malis fractus, portum exoptans agit.* For, if *Buchanan* had the Education of K. *James* committed (or rather deſigned to be committed) to him in the Year 1565,

1565, he could not be appointed to that Office by any other but Q. *Mary* herſelf, who was then *ſui juris*, and in the free Exerciſe of her Government. But of this more fully afterwards.

As to the other Favour, which I ſay *Buchanan* received from Q. *Mary*, *viz.* That he was by her named Maſter of *St. Leonard*'s College: I ſuppoſed that I had Reaſon to think ſo, by what is ſaid by Sir *Rob. Sibbald*, *in vita Buch.* that he was choſen one of the four Electors of the Rector of that Univerſity, in the Years 1566, 1567, and 1568, and that the Rector named him his Vice-rector. And in the Act of Privy Council, wherein *Buchanan* is called upon to attend the Education of the young King, it is expreſly ſaid, "That albeit the Preſentati-
" on, Nomination, and Admiſſion of the Maſter of the ſaid
" College had pertained OF OLD to the Prior of *St. An-*
" *drews*, yet the ſame Right and Patronage pertains to
" our Sovereign Lord, as well by REASON OF THE
" LAWS OF THE REALM, as becauſe the Priory of *St.*
" *Andrews* preſently vaiks deſtitute of a Prior or Com-
" mendatar." From which laſt Words I thought I might infer, that if the Preſentation of a Maſter in *St. Leonard*'s College did, by the Laws of the Realm, belong to the King *anno* 1569, it likewiſe belonged to the Queen *anno* 1566, when ſhe had yet the Reins of the Government in her own Hands: And if in that Year *Buchanan* was Maſter of that College, as Sir *Rob. Sibbald* ſeems to affirm, I ſee nothing that hinders him from being nominated by the Queen to that Office. But if the Vindicator will have it otherwiſe, as the Matter is of ſmall Importance, and as I am afterwards to produce an undoubted Proof of a yet more conſiderable Inſtance of that Queen's Bounty to *Buchanan*, I ſhall not contend with him about this.

The next Thing he challenges me for, is, P. 59. that in my Vindication of *Buchanan*'s Paraphraſe of the Pſalms, and particularly of the noble Epigram or Dedication of it to Q. *Mary*, I have theſe Words, in P. 370.
" I am ſorry to add, that the barbarous Treatment ſhe
" (the Queen) met with from the ſame *Buchanan*, (when

" he changed his Note ſoon after) and her other rebel-
" lious Subjects, gave her but too much Occaſion to
" read that Book (the Pſalms) more than any other."
Theſe indeed are my Words, which I ſtill adhere to: And, if *Buchanan* received the above-mentioned or any other Favours from that *illuſtrious Queen*, as he calls her in the Inſcription to that Epigram, it is impoſſible to vindicate him from being guilty of the vileſt Ingratitude, in the barbarous Treatment he ſhows her in his Hiſtory and Detection. But ſtill, though, as I ſaid, the Conſequence is unavoidable, yet I neither there, nor any where elſe that I remember, directly accuſe him of that Crime.

That the Aſperſions *Buchanan* throws upon that Queen in his ſaid Hiſtory and Detection, are diametrically oppoſite to the glorious *Elogium* he gives of her in the above Dedication, is what cannot be denied. But this Author thinks to clear him by the Words of Mr. *Hunter*, in a Note of his on that Dedication, where he ſays, " If *Buchanan* afterwards wrote any Thing harſher
" againſt her, to be ſure he thought he had Reaſon for
" it: Nor ought this very great *Encomium* on the Queen
" by the Poet, ſupported by true Opinion, hinder him, as
" an Hiſtorian, from relating what he afterwards thought
" proper." I excuſe good Mr. *Hunter*, who is of himſelf a Perſon of a very different Temper from that of *Buchanan* and this his Vindicator, that he, in Imitation of others, ſpeaks as much Good, and as little Ill as he could of the Author he comments upon. But if the Reproaches *Buchanan* has vented upon that illuſtrious Queen, can be, and have been demonſtratively ſhewed to be without Foundation, it is impoſſible for the greateſt Charity to open her Mouth in his Defence. Nay, even ſuppoſing that what *Buchanan* ſays of her were all true, yet the raking into the moſt ſecret Parts of her Conduct, with all the minute Circumſtances attending them, which he could not otherwiſe know but by the Information of her *ſworn*, nay *forſworn* Enemies, and eſpecially the virulent and opprobrious Manner in which he relates them, can hardly, with any well-diſpoſed Perſon, admit of an Apology. And I add, that whoever goes about to juſtify

Bu-

Buchanan in theſe Things, ſeems to be poſſeſt with the ſame Spite and Rancour againſt Q. *Mary* that he himſelf was.

Our Author, however, to ſhew himſelf to be ſuch a one as I have been deſcribing, in his P. 60. tells us, " That *Buchanan* has been pretty much juſtified alrea-
" dy by his contemporary Writers, by the learned Mr.
" *Anderſon* in his valuable Collections, and will be more
" fully ſo, when the learned Anſwers to Mr. *Ruddiman's*
" Preface and Notes on *Buchanan* ſhall be publiſhed."
And then he adds this Bravado, " Mr. *Ruddiman, ſays*
" *he*, has very artfully laid out *Buchanan*'s Ingratitude
" to Q. *Mary*, that if what he ſays were true, it could
" not fail to place him in a very diſadvantageous Light.
" But the Reader will find, from a particular Examina-
" tion of it, that there is not one Word of Truth in it
" from firſt to laſt." What either Juſtice or Truth are in theſe vain Boaſtings ſhall be ſeen afterwards. Of thoſe Writers who were contemporary with *Buchanan*, and the Credit to be given to them in what they write in *Buchanan*'s Juſtification, I have ſaid enough above and elſewhere. As to Mr. *Anderſon*'s Collections, his *Manes* will forgive me to ſay, that he has dealt very partially in that Matter; the greater Part of what is contained in his four large Volumes being taken from thoſe that were Q. *Mary*'s profeſs'd Enemies. Beſides, it can be made appear that he narrates Matters by Halves, ſetting down what the Queen's Adverſaries ſaid againſt her, but omitting the Anſwers made to them by the Commiſſioners on her Part, and the other Papers writ in her Defence, which are yet extant in the ſame Repoſitories whence he produced his Documents. And laſtly, as to the Anſwers to my Preface and Notes on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory, which I have been threatened with near theſe 33 Years, all I ſhall ſay at preſent is, that I would adviſe the Undertakers *hanc Camarinam non movere*, leſt they ſink in that Lake which they would drain. But if, nothwithſtanding, they ſhall ſtill go on with theſe Anſwers, tho' not to be made publick till I am gone, I hope I may ſay,

Exoriare aliquis noſtris ex oſſibus ultor, who will ſup-

port the Cauſe of oppreſſed Innocence, and make theſe Authors aſhamed of their vain Enterprize.

But to return to the main Point we are upon; the Vindicator, in order to purge *Buchanan* from the Scandal of Ingratitude, comes next, P. 61. to enquire "when "he returned to his native Country, after his long Pere-"grination or Exile, as he calls it." The Matter is of no Importance for clearing of *Buchanan*'s Character; but as this Author loves to contradict me, he places his Return to *Scotland* two Years ſooner than I do. He will have him to have returned with his Pupil the Earl of *Murray* in *May* 1561; but I, not till ſome time in the Year 1563; and the Reaſon I give for placing it in that Year is invincible, I having no leſs Evidence for it than *Buchanan*'s own Words, in the Beginning of the Dedication of his Hiſtory, where he ſays expreſly that he had been out of his own Country full 24 Years. Now, if we will compare this with what he ſays of himſelf, *Hiſt. Lib.* xiv. *viz.* that in the Beginning of the Year 1539, being impriſoned on Suſpicion of his being guilty of Hereſy, he made his Eſcape abroad, firſt to *England*, and then to *France*; it will make his Return to *Scotland* to have happened in the above Year 1563; for between 1539 and 1563, are juſt 24 Years. This is confirmed likewiſe by this, that in that ſame Year 1539, he being Uſher to *Goveanus*'s School at *Bourdeaux*, preſented that his noble Poem to the Emperor *Charles* V. which begins,

Vaſconidis regnator aquæ, generoſe Garumna.

For on 30th *Nov.* 1539, that Emperor celebrated at *Bourdeaux* the Feaſt of the *Golden Fleece*, an Order of Knighthood lately inſtituted by him. *See my Notes on* Buchanan's Life, P. 3. and 4.

But let us ſee on what Ground the Vindicator places *Buchanan*'s Return to *Scotland anno* 1561; and it is this: "That he was a Member of a general Aſ-"ſembly of this Church, which met at *Edinburgh* 25th "*December* 1563. Now, *ſays he*, it is not probable he "would have been a Member of that Aſſembly, if he "had not been reſiding for ſome conſiderable Time in

Scot-

" *land* before that." Is our Author here in earneſt? And does he really think that it was ſo difficult a Matter, that the great *Buchanan*, whoſe Fame was celebrated over all the World, and who had been a Confeſſor, and had ſuffered ſo much for the Faith then profeſſed in *Scotland*, ſhould be admitted a Member in an Aſſembly of that Church, unleſs he had reſided upwards of two Years in the Country? I, on the contrary, believe, that the high Reputation his vaſt Learning had acquired him, would have made that Church think it their Honour to have had ſo great a Man a Member in its Aſſemblies upon his firſt Arrival. And of this it was no ſmall Proof, that within little more than three Years thereafter, by an unprecedented Example, he, tho' a Laick, was choſen Moderator to an Aſſembly that ſat down 25th *June* 1567. Beſides, the Aſſembly the Vindicator ſpeaks of did not meet till towards the End of the Year 1563, and *Buchanan* (as his Words in the above two Paſſages will bear) might have returned to *Scotland* in *March* or *April* that Year, *i. e.* ſeveral Months before the down-ſitting of that Aſſembly; which Time was more than ſufficient for making ſo great a Man capable of being choſen a Member of it.

But this Author, who can ſtumble at a Straw, and leap over a Block, and finds Improbabilities where there are none, does, immediately after, P. 62. furniſh us with what would be much more ſurpriſing, if it were true: For he adds, " That Q. *Mary* returned to *Scotland* in " *Auguſt* 1561, and that *Buchanan*'s Epigram ſeems " to have been writ not long after her Arrival, when the " greateſt Joy was expreſt, upon ſeeing their Sovereign, " a young Widow Lady, endued with the greateſt Ac- " compliſhments both of Body and Mind, ſafely arri- " ved." Theſe are high *Elogiums* of that Queen; but they were ſoon after quite forgot, and

Qui color albus erat, nunc eſt contrarius albo,

in the Opinion of this Author and his Party; who juſtify that wicked Faction who in a few Years after contrived and wrought her Ruin. But this a-part; how comes the Vindicator to think that *Buchanan*'s Dedication of his Pſalms

was

was writ soon after Q. *Mary*'s Arrival in *Scotland*, *i. e.* in the Year 1561, when that Work itself was not published till four Years thereafter. It is true *Harry Stephens* informs us, in a Preface to the *liber Psalmorum cum catholica expositione*, which he published *anno* 1562, that he had got *Buchanan*'s Paraphrase into his Hands, and that he designed to put it soon after to the Press. What Reasons he had for delaying the Publication of them three Years longer cannot now be certainly known: But the chief one seems to have been, that as this Paraphrase was *Buchanan*'s *Master-piece*, and which of all his poetical Works he most valued himself upon, he did not think fit it should be made publick till it received further Improvements from his own masterly Hand (*a*). But whatever is in this, is it to be thought that he would write a Dedication of a Book, which was not to come abroad till several Years afterwards? *Buchanan* indeed, in that Epigram, signifies that Q. *Mary* had seen his Paraphrase, and was highly pleased with it, and adds, that, had it not been for the Approbation she had given of it, he would have suppressed it altogether. But that could hardly have been said by him, till the Work itself was upon the Point of being made publick.

The Vindicator, in his P. 64. from the great Respect he bears to me, goes a little out of his Road to set me right in a Point of Chronology, in which he alledges I had gone wrong: "Mr. *Ruddiman*, *says he*, in his Pre-
"face, P. 19. tells us, that it [i. e. *the Detection, of*
"*which he was speaking immediately before*] was wrote
"in the same Year with the Dialogue *de jure regni*, that
"is, according to him, *Pref. P.* 16. *anno* 1569, and
"that it was published *anno* 1571. But *(continues he)*
"Mr. *Ruddiman*, in his Continuation of *Buchanan*'s
"Life, P. 10. *inconsistently indeed with himself*, says,
"the Detection was wrote by him *anno* 1568, when the
"Con-

(*a*) This is much confirmed by what *Buchanan* writes to his Friend *Peter Daniel*, 24th *July* 1566, the next Year, as I suppose, after the first Edition of his Psalms: *In Psalterio*, says he, *multa typographorum errata correxi, quædam etiam mea haud pauca mutavi: quamobrem velim cum Stephano agas, ne me inconsulto id operis iterum emittat.* V. *Buch. Epist.* 3.

" Conference at *York* was appointed by Q. *Elizabeth*;
" and that it was wrote by *Murray*'s Orders. *And he*
" *adds*, See alſo his Note on *Hiſt. lib.* 19. *P.* 461."

This is a Piece of ſuch unfair Dealing in our Author, that I could not eaſily bear it, if I was not accuſtomed to it. For 1. He repreſents me as affirming that poſitively, which I do only by way of Conjecture. As to my ſaying that *Buchanan*'s Dialogue *de jure regni* was writ in the Year 1569, I add, *ut ego conjicio*, as I gueſs. And of the other, *viz. Libellus cui detectio nomen datur*, I ſay in my *Preface*, P. 19. *Eodem tempore ſcriptus videtur*, it ſeems to have been writ at that ſame Time. But, 2. Neither in the Note on *Buchanan*'s Life, P. 10. nor in that on his Hiſtory, P. 461. [the Places our Author refers to] do I ſay *hoc anno*, but *eo tempore*, and *hoc tempore*, and in the former Note I add, *aut non multo poſt*. The Act of Privy Council, appointing Commiſſioners in the King's Name to meet at the Conference to be held at *York*, was dated 18th *September*, 1568; and that Conference did not break up till ſome Time in *January* 1569: Might I not then juſtly ſay that the *Detection* was writ *at* or *about that Time*, *i. e. anno* 1569? there wanting little more than three Months to bring it to that Year. He knows not *Latin*, who knows not that the Words *eo* or *hoc tempore*, will admit of a much greater Latitude than is here neceſſary: And if ſo, where is my Inconſiſtency?

But as the Vindicator brings a Sentence of *Cicero* againſt me, in his P. 34. he will allow me to apply to him another of the ſame Author, *Non modo accuſator, ſed ne objurgator quidem ferendus eſt is, qui quod in altero vitium reprehendit, in eo ipſe deprehenditur*. Cic. in Verr. lib. 3. cap. 2. For he who is ſo ſharp-ſighted in ſpying a Mote (as he fancied) in my Eye, has not obſerved the Beam in his own; when immediately after he falls into no fewer than ſix Miſtakes, (Blunders I may call them) ſome of them the groſſeſt that a Man can readily be guilty of. For 1. " Bp. *Nicolſon*, *ſays he*, and " Mr. *Ruddiman* ſeem to think that *Buchanan* wrote " his *Detection* in *Latin* firſt.—But, *he adds*, from Mr.

" *An-*

" *Anderſon*'s Collections (*a*), it rather ſeems evident that " *Buchanan* wrote it in the old *Scots* Language." But both Bp. *Nicolſon* and I, not only *ſeem to think*, but poſitively affirm, that it was writ firſt by *Buchanan* in *Latin*; and there needs no other Proof of it than this, that in the *Scots* Copy of it publiſhed in Mr. *Anderſon*'s Collections, it is expreſly ſaid to be TRANSLATIT OUT OF THE LATINE QUHILK WAS WRITTEN BE M. G. B. *i. e.* Mr. *George Buchanan*; and the other two ancient Copies, printed the one in *England*, and the other in *Scotland* [from which laſt Mr. *Anderſon* took his] ſay the ſame. And the *French* Copy (falſly ſaid to be printed *a Edimbourg par Thomas Waltem*, 1572) ſays, without mentioning the Author, *traduicte de Latin en François*. 2. He ſays, " It was printed at *St. Andrews* by *Robert* " *Lekpreuick*, *anno* 1571, not, *adds he*, in 1572, as Sir " *Robert Sibbald* and the Biſhop think." Whereas the Copy publiſhed by Mr. *Anderſon*, taken, as I ſaid, from *Lekpreuik*'s Edition, (which I now have in my Hands) manifeſtly bears theſe Words, IMPRENTIT AT SANCTANDROIS BE ROBERT LEKPREUIK, ANNO DO. M. D. LXXII. 3. He ſays, " That the Edition printed in *England* was " poſterior to that printed in *Scotland*." Whereas the Edition in *England* was firſt publiſhed, as appears by a Letter of *Alexander Hay*, Clerk of the Privy Council, to *John Knox*, *anno* 1571, wherein he repeats the reproachful Lines againſt Q. *Mary* at the End of it, which are not in *Lekpreuik*'s Edition (*b*). 4. He ſays, " That the E- " dition printed in *England* is faſhioned according to " the Idiom of the *Engliſh* Tongue." Whereas the Language in both is the ſame, there being no Difference be-

(*a*) All that Mr. *Anderſon* ſays is, that he and ſome others thought that *Buchanan*'s *Detection* was tranſlated from his own *Latin* into *Scots* by himſelf. But that they are miſtaken is evident from this, that the Tranſlator, whoever he was, has miſſed the Senſe of the Original in ſome Places, which *Buchanan* himſelf could not poſſibly be guilty of. This Obſervation I had from that worthy Gentleman, and ſingular Ornament of his Country, the late Mr. *Andrew Fletcher* of *Salton*: And I have given ſome Proofs of it in my Notes on that famous Piece.

(*b*) This Letter is dated 14th *December* 1571, inſerted at full Length in *Calderwood*'s MS. Hiſtory.

between them ſave only in the ſpelling of ſome Words, and the Alteration of one or two proper Names. 5. He thinks that the *French* Verſion was made from what he calls the ſecond Edition in *Scots*. Whereas the Tranſlator himſelf tells us in his Preface, that *he not underſtanding the* Scots *Language, had choſen to expreſs all that he found in* Latin, meaning certainly that which was writ by *Buchanan*. But, 6. The worſt of all is, that he ſays, " The *Latin* Copy of the *Detection* is not *Buchanan*'s, " but was tranſlated from the *French* one; which any " body that has a tolerable Knowledge of the *Latin*, muſt " ſee has nothing of the Purity and Elegance of *Buchanan*'s Diction, there being beſides many *Galliciſms* in " it." Where has this hypercritical Cenſor, this new *Ariſtarchus*, acquired his wondrous Skill in judging of the Purity and Elegance of *Latin* Performances? For I, who pretend to ſome Knowledge in that Matter, (and ſo I believe will all others who are converſant in reading *Latin* Writings) ſo far differ from this Author, that I am fully perſuaded, not only that *Buchanan* was the original Author of that Piece (*a*), but alſo that for the Purity and Elegance of its Stile, it is inferior to nothing that ever he wrote: And I will add, that (bating the Malignity and Virulency of it) it is hardly to be equalled by any in that Age, in which the writing of *Latin* was cultivated to the higheſt Degree. But this Author pretends alſo to have found many *Galliciſms* in it. It is indeed poſſible, that, as *Buchanan* lived a great Part of his Time in *France*, ſomething of that Language might have crept into his *Latin* Stile. But I wiſh the Vindicator had given ſome Inſtances of theſe many *Galliciſms* he pretends to have found in *Buchanan*'s *Detection*; and, as he and his Friend Mr. *Logan* have given me Challenges of the like Kind, ſo I here challenge him to produce me a few of the many *Galliciſms* he ſpeaks of. But before he

 ſets

(*a*) What confirms this to a very high Degree, is, that *Buchanan* has borrowed from and inſerted in his Hiſtory, whole Paſſages, Word for Word, that are to be found in his *Detection*; which it is hardly to be ſuppoſed he would have done, had not the *Detection* been originally writ in *Latin* by himſelf.

ſets about it, I would adviſe him firſt to read *Harry Stephen*'s learned Treatiſe *de Latinitate falsò ſuſpecta*, wherein that celebrated Author ſhews that many Phraſes and Ways of ſpeaking, which ſome have miſtaken for *Galliciſms*, are to be found in good *Roman* Authors. It may alſo be worth his while to look to a Book of the ſame kind, writ by that able Critick and Commentator *Jo. Vorſtius*, who vouches claſſical Authority for what ſome have fancied to be *Germaniſms*. I am therefore much afraid that this Author will find himſelf no leſs miſtaken, as to the *Galliciſms* he pretends to have found in the *Latin* of *Buchanan*'s *Detection*, than he is with reſpect to the other pretended Inelegancies of its Stile; and that, for all the Airs he here gives himſelf of his Skill in theſe two Languages, it is but indifferent in both.

What he ſubjoins after this, is to me utterly incomprehenſible. " And this, *ſays he*, poſſibly may ſerve " as a Key to the grand Performance we are promiſed " on this Head by Mr. *Ruddiman*'s Friend." It muſt be a ſtrange Key this, that is made up of a Heap of groſs Miſtakes and Blunders. But ſuppoſe they were all true, what Door or Cabinet can it open? Or what Light can it give to the Controverſy concerning Q. *Mary*, Whether the *Detection* was firſt writ in *Scots* or *Latin?* Whether the *Scots* Copy was printed in the Year 1571 or 1572? Or whether the *Latin* Copy was the Performance of *Buchanan* himſelf, or done from the *French* by another?

The Vindicator tells us next, P. 66. " That he can" not but obſerve, that it is falſe what Mr. *Ruddiman* " here aſſerts, that *Buchanan* wrote the *Detection* by " *Murray*'s Orders." And for this he brings a Letter in Mr. *Anderſon*'s Collections, Vol. II. P. 260. from a Gentleman at that Time: " By which, *ſays he*, we are " informed, that the *Detection* was writ before the Re" gent ſet out in his Journey for *York*, not by *Murray*'s " Orders, but from Inſtructions *Buchanan* received from " the Lords of the Privy Council, at a Conference they " had, which *Buchanan* was directed by them to put in " Order; that they reviewed it thereafter, and appro-

" ved

" ved of it." This Letter the Vindicator has thought fit to transfigure to his own Mind, in Words quite different from thoſe in the Original, which are theſe : " The Book itſelf, with the Oration of Evidence, is " written in *Latin* by a learned Man in *Scotland*, Mr. " *George Buchanan*.---Beſides that the *Book* was written " by him, not as of himſelf, nor in his own Name, but " according to the Inſtructions to hym given by com- " mon Conference of the Lordes of the Privie Counſel of " *Scotland*, by hym only for his Learnyng penned, but " by them the Matter miniſtred, the Books ouerſeen and " allowed, *&c.*" From this we learn two Things : 1. That the *Detection* was writ originally in *Latin* by *Buchanan* himſelf, contrary to what the Vindicator has aſſerted in his preceeding Page. And, 2. (which is more material here) that the Words [NOT BY MURRAY'S ORDERS] are not in that Letter, but are foiſted in by the Vindicator, to impoſe upon his unwary Readers. As to the Matter itſelf, where is the great Falſhood he accuſes me of, in aſſerting that *Buchanan* wrote the *Detection* by *Murray*'s Orders, tho' he had Inſtructions given, and ſome Materials furniſhed him by the Lords of the Privy Council ? For who knows not, that *Murray*, as Regent, was at the Head of that Faction, who called themſelves *Lords of the Privy Council*, and had the chief Direction of all Affairs that came before them ? May it not then properly enough be ſaid, that the *Orders* given to *Buchanan* to draw up that Libel againſt Q. *Mary*, proceeded at firſt from his great Patron the E. of *Murray* ; who (tho' *Buchanan* was none of the Commiſſioners appointed for that Conference) took him along with him for that Purpoſe ? Thus all Orders and Commiſſions given by the King, tho' at firſt ſuggeſted and prepared by ſome of his Privy Counſellors, are juſtly called and accounted his Orders and Commiſſions.

Our Author comes now more directly, in his P. 67. to remove the Scandal of the Ingratitude *Buchanan* is by ſeveral good Authors charged with : And the only Way he takes, or could take, to do it, is by his endeavouring to prove a *Negative, viz.* that he never received any Fa-

Favours from that Queen, and of Conſequence that he was under no Obligations to her for them. Tho' I no where, as I have often ſaid, directly accuſe *Buchanan* of that Crime, yet I mention indeed two Favours beſtowed on him by Q. *Mary*, which, if true, certainly required far other Returns from him than ſhe afterwards met with at his Hands. The firſt was, that he was by that Princeſs choſen Preceptor to her Son. And the ſecond, that he had a Preſentation from her to be Maſter of *St. Leonard*'s College in *St. Andrews*. Of both theſe I have ſaid ſomething already; and have nothing more to add with reſpect to the ſecond. But as to the former I own there is ſome Difficulty. That *Buchanan* ſhould be pitched upon to be Preceptor to a Child not yet born, ſeem'd to myſelf ſomewhat incredible; and therefore in my Notes on that Author's Life, P. 9. I ſuppoſed, that by an Overſight of *Buchanan*, or his Printer, an Error may perhaps have crept in; and that inſtead of, *Cui* [*Jacobo ſexto*] *erudiendo erat præfectus anno milleſimo quingenteſimo ſexageſimo quinto*, we ſhould read,——*ſexageſimo nono*; *Buchanan* not having entred upon the actual Exerciſe of that Office till the End of that Year 1569, or (according to our preſent Computation) the Beginning of the Year 1570. But becauſe the Sentence has the Words at full Length,——*ſexageſimo quinto*, and not in Letters, M. D. LXV. or in Cyphers, 1565, I would not take upon me to make any Alteration; eſpecially as the Thing, after all, tho' extraordinary, is very far from being impoſſible. For as the Eyes of all *Scotland* were upon *Buchanan*, as the moſt learned Man this Country had ever produced, and inferior to none of any other then in the World, it is not ſo hard a Matter as this Author repreſents it, to believe that Q. *Mary* ſhould before-hand make Choice of him, as incomparably the fitteſt of all her Subjects, for being put upon that Employment. It is true, ſhe could not then know whether ſhe was with Child of a Son or a Daughter (*a*); but as the Child to be born was

(*a*) I will add further, that tho' the Infant Q. *Mary* was then with Child of, ſhould have proved a Girl, it is not incredible but that ſhe might

was to be Heir not only of *Scotland*, but very probably alſo of *England*, it is not abſurd to ſuppoſe that the Mother might have ſuch a Forecaſt: And I doubt not but that there have been Examples of it in other Kingdoms.

Here, by the bye, I muſt take Notice that the Vindicator is wrong in his Reckoning, when he ſays, that the Queen *was little more than three Months gone with Child at that Time*, i. e. in the Year 1565. For, if we ſuppoſe that *Buchanan* followed the Computation then received in *Scotland*, (as he frequently does elſewhere) which begins the Year 25th *March*, Q. *Mary* might have been with Child of her Son ſix Months, when ſhe pitched on *Buchanan* for his Inſtructor. This Son *James* VI. was born 19th *June* 1566: Allowing then the ordinary Time of nine Months for his being in his Mother's Womb, he was conceived 19th *September* 1565: From that to the 25th *March* excluſively, 1565-6, is full ſix Months. If then *Buchanan*, as I ſaid, followed the then *Scots* Computation, he may have been *Præceptor deſignatus* to K. *James* in *March* 1565-6.

There is one Word of *Buchanan* that indeed ſticks with me, *viz. præfectus*, which in the common Acceptation of it could not be true, K. *James* being not born till ſeveral Months thereafter: But perhaps *Buchanan* meant no more, but that he was *electus*, *præelectus*, or *deſignatus*, to that Office, when his Pupil ſhould be of Age for receiving Inſtruction. But why ſhould I be blamed in this Affair, who was aware of theſe Difficulties: And that the Vindicator has ſaid no more of them than I had ſaid before him? I could not however get over *Buchanan*'s own expreſs Words, and theſe ſet down at Length, and not in numeral Letters or Figures, which bear that he was *appointed* or *pre-appointed* Preceptor to K. *James* in

might before-hand have caſt about for a fit Perſon to whom her Education ſhould be entruſted; it being uſual at that Time with ſovereign Princes to give to their Children, Females as well as Males, all Manner of liberal Education. Witneſs Q. *Elizabeth*, who had Mr. *Aſcham*, then the moſt accompliſhed Perſon in the *Belles Lettres* in all *England*, for her Preceptor; under whoſe Care ſhe became an excellent Scholar both in *Greek* and *Latin*; Specimens of which, wrote with her own Hand, I have ſeen in the *Cotton* Library.

in the Year *One thouſand five hundred and ſixty-five.* And as the Thing, for the Reaſons I have given above, is far from being impoſſible, I durſt not do otherwiſe than I have done.

This Author adds here, " That it is no way credible " that Q. *Mary*, who was bred up a zealous Papiſt, would " make Choice of *Buchanan*, who was a no leſs zealous " Proteſtant, to be Preceptor to her Son." How zealous a Papiſt Q. *Mary* then was does not much appear, ſhe being then but young, and her Affairs in a pretty good Condition, at which Time Princes uſe not to be very ſanguine as to Matters of Religion. But whatever is in that, this Author has himſelf removed the Difficulty, by telling us in his P. 62. that the Queen was adviſed " by " her own Popiſh Friends in *France*, to temporize, and " to repoſe moſt upon thoſe of the reformed Religion." That ſhe complied throughly with that political Advice, we need no other Proof but this, that from her Return out of *France*, *anno* 1561, to near the Time of her Marriage with Lord *Darnly*, *anno* 1565, ſhe was directed in all her Counſels by thoſe of that Religion, and particularly by her baſe Brother the E. of *Murray*, who was at the Head of her Affairs during that whole Time. And if Proteſtants only or chiefly were employed by her in Matters of State, why might ſhe not alſo employ a Proteſtant to inſtil the firſt Rudiments of polite Literature into her Son; eſpecially as he was by all thought the propereſt Perſon ſhe could pitch on for that Office? That he was in high Favour with her at that Time, appears not only from the Dedication of his Pſalms, which I cannot help thinking (notwithſtanding all the Vindicator has ſaid to the contrary) muſt have been wrote *anno* 1565, in which they were firſt publiſhed; but alſo from the many other Poems wrote by him upon the Queen's Marriage with Lord *Darnly*, and afterwards, in which he extolls her to the Skies, and for which we have no Reaſon to doubt but that he was liberally rewarded.

The Vindicator adds, in P. 68. " That Mr. *Ruddi-* " *man* ſeems to have been ſenſible of this Abſurdity." What Abſurdity, pray? *That Q.* Mary *ſhould make Choice*

of

of a Proteſtant to be her Son's Preceptor; for that is what he immediately before ſpeaks of. But let us hear him out: "And therefore, *ſays he*, Mr. *Ruddiman* "adds, [*viz. in vit. Buch. p.* 8. *col.* 2.] *Tho' there* "*be no good Authority for thoſe Things, yet many Things* "*ſeem to confirm them; eſpecially this, that otherwiſe* "*we ſhall find no good Senſe in* Lucas Fruterius's *Letter* "*to* Buchanan." But there is no one that with any Care reads my Note on that Place, who will not ſee that the Thing or Things I am there ſpeaking of, do not relate to what is here mentioned by this Author. The Queſtion I am there upon is, whether *Buchanan* did not ſome time in the Year 1565, a little after the Queen's Marriage with Lord *Darnly* (for we are ſure he was in *Scotland* at that Time) take a Trip into *France*, and not return till towards the End of that Year (*a*). I found a Letter of *Lucas Fruterius*, a very learned Man of *Buchanan*'s Acquaintance, which I cannot make Senſe of without ſuch a Supposition. Upon this I found a Conjecture, (very ſlender and uncertain I own it is) that Q. *Mary* finding herſelf with Child, might have perhaps ſent for *Buchanan* to return Home, with a Deſign to put that Child, if a Son, under his Diſcipline, when capable of it. And then I ſubjoin theſe Words: *Hæc licet a nullo idoneo auctore memoriæ prodita, multa tamen confirmare videntur, illud in primis, quod nullum ex Fruterii epiſtola ſenſum alio quovis modo elicere poſſe videamur*, i. e. Tho' theſe Things are not particularly related by any good Author, yet, *&c.* But what are the Things I have been there ſpeaking of? Only theſe two: That *Buchanan* was for ſome ſhort Time, towards the End of the Year 1565, in *France*, and that he was perhaps called Home by Q. *Mary* for the Purpoſe there mentioned. The laſt of theſe is a mere Conjecture, which I laid no Streſs upon: But the former I cannot help thinking is ſtrongly inſinuated in that Letter of *Fruterius*. It is true that Letter has no other Date

(*a*) That *Buchanan* was in *Scotland* on the firſt of *January* 1566, according to the preſent Computation, is evident from the *Strena*, or *New-year's Epigram*, he wrote to the Lord *Darnly*, whom he calls King *Henry*.

Date than that it was writ 1ſt *February.* But that it was writ in the Year 1566, to me appeared pretty evident from theſe Words in it, *Audio, mi Buchanane, non paucis diebus te ventorum faſtidia tuliſſe, et nuper tamen.* [And then follow theſe elegant Verſes :]

Ventis iiſſe tuis † dulciſſimæ
Ad alta tecta patriæ,
Quæ te tuoſque canulos jamdudum amat
Vincire caris oſculis.
Quid hîc amica gaudia eloquar tua ?
Quid gaudia illa regia ?
O ter beatâ ſorte devinctum caput,
Quòd Rexque, paterque, equeſque amant.

For what elſe can be meant by theſe three laſt Lines, but the great Joy with which *Buchanan* would be received, upon his Return, at the *Scottiſh* Court, and the Love and Eſteem that would be ſhewed him *by the King, Queen, and all Ranks in* Scotland. And as *Fruterius* could not but know that we had no King in *Scotland* for upwards of 20 Years backwards, till Q. *Mary* took for her Husband the Lord *Darnly*, whom therefore ſhe honoured with the Name of King ; and that not being till after their Marriage 29th *July* 1565, this Letter, dated 1ſt *Feb.* muſt (according to the Senſe I put upon theſe Words) have been writ in the Year 1566. But whatever is in all this, the Vindicator muſt ſtrain very hard before he can ſqueeze out of my Words the Abſurdity he pretends I am ſenſible of, *viz.* That Q. *Mary* deſigned *Buchanan* to be her Son's Preceptor, *tho' a Proteſtant*, he being in all other Reſpects incomparably the beſt qualified for that Province of any in her Majeſty's Dominions.

But the Vindicator adds further, " Mr. *Ruddiman* alledges

† It is ſo printed in *Gruter*'s Edition, whence I had it, in his *Theſaurus Criticus, Tom.* V. *p.* 392. But I believe, that the Printer has omitted the Word *te*, which is neceſſary to make this Verſe a true *Iambick*, as the reſt are; and that we ſhould read it,
Ventis iiſſe te tuis dulciſſimæ.

" ledges this Letter muſt be writ on the 1ſt of *February*
" 1566, and before the Summer of that Year, becauſe
" *Fruterius* then died. No, ſays Mr. *Burman*, that
" can't be, becauſe *Fruterius* died in the Month of
" *March* that Year, and he gueſſes it was writ in *Feb.*
" 1565. It is groping in the Dark in both, and it is
" hard to rate a Man for Ingratitude upon ſuch Gueſs-
" work." The Vindicator, after his uſual Manner, lo es to pervert my Words, and makes me ſo ſenſeleſs a o ſay, that a Letter writ on the 1ſt of *Feb.* 1566, muſt h e been writ before the Summer of that Year; as if t e one did not neceſſarily imply the other. All that I y, in a Note on that Letter, is, that *Thuanus*, *Hiſt. ib.* 38. informs us, that *Fruterius* died in Summer 1566, nd that therefore that Letter muſt have been writ in or efore that Year. *Burman* indeed is more particular, who from a Letter of *Giphanius*, tells us, that *Fruterius* died in *March* 1566. But that Author ſpeaks Nonſenſe, when he ſays that Letter was writ *anno* 1565, and yet allows it to have been writ after *Darnly*'s Marriage; for that Marriage having been celebrated in the End of *July* 1565, a Letter dated 1ſt *February* after it, muſt have been writ in the Year 1566, according to our preſent Computation. By the bye, I obſerve, that Mr. *Burman* has made the ſame Inference from *Fruterius*'s Letter that I have done, *viz.* that it was penn'd after *Darnly*'s Marriage. But there is no Abſurdity that a Perſon who wrote a Letter on 1ſt *February*, might be dead in the *March* following (*a*).

This Author adds, P. 69. " We don't at all find,
" *ſays he*, that *Buchanan* reſorted much to Q. *Mary*'s
" Court, either before or after her Marriage with Lord
" *Darnly*." As *Buchanan*'s great Patron the E. of *Murray* had the chief Management of the Queen's Affairs before that Marriage, it is not improbable but that he would have him frequently with him at Court. But that at the Time of, and after that Marriage, *Buchanan* re-

 ſorted

(*a*) Eſpecially as *Thuanus* ſays of him, that *dum pilæ ludo ſe intemperanter exerceret, frigidâ potâ ſtatim in morbum, quem ferre non potuit, incidit, & cum vix annum* XXV. *attigiſſet, vivis exemptus eſt.*

ſorted to it, appears from the many Poems writ by him on that Occaſion, and the *Strenæ*, or *New-year's Sonnets* preſented by him both to the Queen and her Huſband, which are extant in his 3d Book of Epigrams. And yet this Author has the Confidence to conclude here, " That this alone [*i. e. Buchanan*'s not coming to Q. " *Mary*'s Court, the contrary whereof I have ſhewed to be " very probable] renders the whole of *Fruterius*'s obſcure " Verſes an abſolute Joke." This *Fruterius* was a Perſon of good Senſe as well as Learning, and certainly he had ſome rational Meaning in theſe his Verſes. And I give the Vindicator a Defiance to put any other upon them than I have done. But every Thing, it ſeems, muſt be turned into Ridicule, that does not quadrate with this Author's Schemes.

He comes next to *the Act of Privy Council*, by which *Buchanan* is called from his Maſterſhip of *St. Leonard*'s College, to attend K. *James*'s Education. I ſhall readily grant him that this Act paſs'd after the E. of *Murray*'s Death, and before the E. of *Lennox* was choſen Regent, probably in *January* or *February* 1569-70. But it is far from being certain, as the Vindicator would have it, that it was not till then that *Buchanan* was pitched on to be K. *James*'s Preceptor. It is vaſtly more natural to think, from its Preamble, that he was deſtined to that Office ſome Time at leaſt, if not Years before. For it begins thus : " The Lords of Secret Council, and others of the " Nobility and Eſtates being conveened, for taking Or- " der in the Affairs of this Common-wealth, among o- " ther Matters being careful of the King's Majeſty's Pre- " ſervation and good Education, and conſidering how " neceſſary the Attendance of Mr. *George Buchanan*, " Maſter of *St. Leonard*'s College within the Univerſity " of *St. Andrews*, upon his Highneſs ſhall be, and that " it behoves the ſaid Mr. *George* to withdraw himſelf " from the Charge of the ſaid College, if he makes con- " tinual Reſidence with his Majeſty, *&c.*" Had this Act been deſigned as a Commiſſion to *Buchanan* to be the King's Preceptor, it can hardly be thought it would have been conceived in theſe Terms: But, beſides, whoever

reads

reads the reſt of it will ſee, that the chief Deſign of it was to allow *Buchanan* to chooſe his own Succeſſor, and to admit one, Mr. *Patrick Adamſon*, the Perſon he had named, into that Charge, *with all Immunities, Privileges, Commodities and Duties belonging to the ſame.* For ſo this Act in the End expreſly bears. There is therefore nothing in this Act that hinders *Buchanan* from being pitched upon to be the King's Preceptor by the Queen herſelf, *anno* 1565-6; which he himſelf writes in as many Words.

The Vindicator proceeds, P. 73. " This Record of " the Privy Council, *ſays he*, as given by Mr. *Ruddiman*, " is imperfect, ending abruptly, and wants a Date. If it " is really ſo, there is no Help for it. But if it has a " Date, I can't think he has acted fair with the Publick " in not giving it." How ready is this Author to point out my Faults, ſo as not to omit where there may be Ground for ſuſpecting there are any. This Act I had from the E. of *Haddington*'s valuable Collections in the Advocate's Library; and I have given it fairly as I found it, without omitting any Thing, ſave only ſome few Words at the End, which are of *common Form*, and of no Importance in the Affair. As to its Date, I found none at the Act itſelf; only at the Top of the Page is marked 1569. And ſo little had I a Deſign of concealing its Date, that in that P. 9. where I give the Recital of it, I ſay that it was written *ſub finem, ut credibile eſt, anni* 1569, *i. e.* according to our modern Computation, 1570. There is indeed one Omiſſion I may ſeem to have been guilty of, that I have not ſet down the Title which is given it either by the ſaid E. of *Haddington*, or to the Act itſelf, *viz. Dimiſſion of* Buchannane, *in Favours of* Adameſoune, *of the Provoſtrie of St. Leonard's* College; which confirms not a little what I ſaid before, that it was not deſigned as a Commiſſion to *Buchanan* to be the King's Preceptor, but a Preſentation to that Mr. *Adamſon* to be his Succeſſor as Head of that College of *St. Leonard's*.

But the Vindicator, who ſtill lies upon the Catch, fancies he has here diſcovered me guilty of a groſs Error: For he adds, " This Obſervation, *viz. That this Act*

" *was writ after Regent* Murray's *Death (which I no*
" *where deny*) likewiſe confutes another Miſtake Mr.
" *Ruddiman* has fallen into with reſpect to Mr. *Peter*
" *Young*, of whom he ſays [*vit. Buch. p.* 20. *col.* 1.]
" that in the ſame Year 1569, he was given as a Col-
" league to *Buchanan* to direct the King's Studies, by
" *Murray* the Regent. It is plain, *adds he*, Mr. *Young*
" was aſſociated to *Buchanan*, not by *Murray* the Re-
" gent, becauſe he was dead, but by the Privy Council
" afterwards, ſeeing he is not mentioned in this Record."
But I muſt tell this Author, that, for all his Sharp-ſight-
edneſs, he is much out in his Calculations: For that that
excellent Gentleman, and fine Scholar, Mr. *Peter* [af-
terwards Sir *Peter*] *Young*, was appointed to wait on the
King by the E. of *Murray* Regent, we have the moſt
unexceptionable of all Witneſſes, and that is Sir *Peter*
Young himſelf; who in the *Diary* wrote with his own
Hand, and ſubjoined to his Life by the learned Dr. *Tho-
mas Smith*, Keeper of the *Cottonian* Library, expreſly
tells us, that *Regi ſuo inſervivit ab ipſis pene incunabulis,
admotus per Proregem ipſius infantiæ ſtatim a trimatu.*
And that we may not be in Doubt who this *Prorex* or
Regent was, he in the next Page informs us in theſe
Words, *Januarii quarto. Admiſſus in clientelam Regis,
A.* 1569 *deſinente, Comite de Murray tunc temporis Gu-
bernatore, anno ætatis meæ viceſimo quinto*; *i. e.* 19
Days before that Regent's Death, he being killed 23d
of that *January*. What therefore this Author talks of
Sir *Peter Young*'s being appointed a Colleague to *Bucha-
nan* by an Act of Privy Council after the E. of *Murray*'s
Death, is not only falſe, but quite foreign to the Pur-
poſe (*a*).

The Vindicator being full of his doughty Performance,
is ſo vain, upon finiſhing this firſt Part of it, as to con-
clude with theſe triumphant Words, " From what has
" been

(*a*) My Reader will here forgive me to mention, that I had the Ho-
nour of being Tutor to the late worthy and moſt accompliſhed Gentle-
man *David Young* of *Auldbar*, in the County of *Angus*, who was the
lineal Heir and Repreſentative of the above Sir *Peter Young*, and is ſuc-
ceeded in his Eſtate, as well as Virtue, by his Son the preſent *Robert
Young* of *Auldbar*.

" been ſaid, I perſuade myſelf, *ſays he*, the impartial " Reader is convinced that I have fully cleared the great " *Buchanan* from the Ingratitude he is charged with to " Q. *Mary* by theſe Authors, which was what was un- " dertaken to be done ;" *i. e.* in the mathematical Way. Q. E. F. But tho' I am none of thoſe Authors that directly accuſe *Buchanan* of Ingratitude, yet this his Vindicator will excuſe me to think, by what I have above repreſented, that (notwithſtanding this his boaſted Demonſtration) he will need yet ſome more Soap and Nitre, before he can get his Favourite throughly purged from that fouleſt of all Stains: For,

Suppoſing that *Buchanan* owed neither of theſe two Favours above-mentioned to the Benevolence of that Queen, yet may he not have received ſome other ſuch Inſtances of her Goodneſs, as might, had he been grateful for them, have reſtrained him from the vile Reproaches he has (and that moſt falſly too) caſt upon her? That he was for ſome Time in great Favour with Q. *Mary*, appears, as I ſaid, from the many Poems he has wrote in Commendation of her truly noble and Princely Virtues; for which it is but juſt to think that he received ſome ſuitable Gratification. But tho' this alſo ſhould be deducted from the Account, there is another Thing which with me leaves a deep Tincture of Ingratitude upon *Buchanan*'s Character, *viz.* That he ſhould have treated the Mother of that Prince, whoſe Education was committed to his Care, in ſuch a vile and opprobrious Manner: For I need not ſay, what King, but what Gentleman upon Earth, would not think it the greateſt Indignity that could be offered him, that his own immediate Tutor and Attendant, who ſat at his Table, and ſhared ſo much of his Favour, ſhould brand his Mother as a Murderer, an Adultereſs, and a Perſon abandoned to all kind of Wickedneſs; and that in the moſt cruel and atrocious Manner that he could invent or expreſs? And yet to this Day, ſuch is the Rancour of the Party againſt both Mother and Son, that the juſt Reſentment of K. *James* (which filial Duty prompted him to) againſt *Buchanan*, and all others who had reproached his Mother,

is

is with ſome of them reckoned not the leaſt of that King's Faults.

But if all theſe Things, to ſave the great *Buchanan*'s Reputation, muſt go for nothing, there is one Article yet remains to be ſtated to his Accompt, which (whether the Vindicator will or not) will fix an indelible Stain of Ingratitude upon *Buchanan*'s Memory, and ſuch as no Art can poſſibly wipe off: And that is, that in the very next Year after his Return to his own Country, this ſame Q. *Mary*, his moſt gracious Sovereign and Miſtreſs, did ſettle upon him a yearly Penſion of no leſs than five hundred Pounds *Scots*; a Sum that in thoſe Days would have gone further than five Times ſo much would do now. If ſuch a Favour as that did not require a ſuitable Return, then neither is Gratitude a Virtue, nor Ingratitude a Vice. What ſhall we think then of him, who inſtead of having a due Senſe on his Mind of ſo conſiderable and unmerited a Bounty, did make it his Buſineſs to load the Memory of his great Benefactreſs with the blackeſt and moſt odious Character that could be given her? That *Buchanan* had that Penſion granted by Q. *Mary*, is atteſted by a Deed of hers in the publick Records, under her own Privy Seal; a Copy whereof I have given in the Appendix, No. I. And if *Buchanan*'s after Behaviour was quite the reverſe of what it ought to have been, upon the Receipt of ſo great a Favour, I ſee no other Way left to this his Vindicator for clearing him from the Blot of Ingratitude, but that, in Imitation of his Friend Mr. *Logan*, (who damns all Writs that are brought againſt him of Fraud and Impoſture) he ſhould likewiſe deny this to be a true and genuine Deed of that Queen.

III. *Of*

III. *Of the Vindicator's Appendix.*

THE Design of this Author's *Appendix* is to set two very great Men, *Isaac Casaubon*, and President *de Thou* at Variance after their Death, who, for a good Number of Years, and to the last, lived in the highest and most entire Friendship. And what is the Reason of all this? No other, but because *Is. Casaubon*, in a pretty long Letter to that President, endeavours to persuade him to rectify the gross Errors *Buchanan* and others had led him into, with respect to the Affairs of our Q. *Mary*, in the next Edition of his Histories. This, with the Admirers of *Buchanan*, and Enemies of that Queen, is, it seems, alone sufficient to depretiate *Casaubon*'s Character, and to expose him (as he here does, P. 74. and 75.) as *a Sycophant, a Time-server, a mercenary Hireling and Tool to King* James, at whose Desire he wrote that Letter.

Having above, P. 26. vindicated that great and good Man *Is. Casaubon* from the Reproaches thrown upon him by this Author on the foresaid Account, I come now to examine the chief Topicks he goes upon to justify the ill Things President *de Thou* has wrote of Q. *Mary*: And these are contained in a Letter of his to Mr. *Camden* upon that Subject; a Copy whereof this Author has taken Care to give us in this his *Appendix*, together with his English Translation, and Observations upon it. Before he presents us with that Letter, he runs out into a high *Elogium* of President *de Thou*, "That he was a moderate *Roman* "*Catholick*, a very great Lover of Truth, a Man of the "greatest Honour, swayed by no Interest, Party or "Faction." All this I shall grant to be true of that great and extraordinary Person. But what he adds from *Old-mixon* (the most faithless and worthless of all Historians) is rather a Derogation from, than an Addition to *de Thou*'s Character: "That he was as much su-"perior to *Camden*, to whom he directs his Letter, as "the first Magistrate in *France* is to the lowest School-"master in *England*." For, besides that President *de Thou* himself had a quite different Opinion of *Camden*'s great

great Learning and Ingenuity, from what that contemptible Author *Old-mixon* ſays of him, (as appears from his Letters to *Camden*, publiſhed by Dr. *Smith* :) What has either the Eminency or Lowneſs of Station to do in this Matter; when the Road of Virtue, Probity, Honeſty and Veracity, lies equally patent to all Ranks of People, and is more frequently trod by Perſons of meaner Fortunes, than by thoſe that move in the higheſt Sphere of worldly Greatneſs? And it is equally true both with reſpect to the Virtue and Happineſs of thoſe of low Life, what is ſaid by the Poet,

——————— *Licet ſub paupere tecto*
Reges & Regum vitâ præcurrere amicos.

But to return, might not that great Man Monſieur *de Thou*, notwithſtanding the noble Character here given him, which in the general I acknowledge to be due to him; might not he, I ſay, have been impoſed upon by the falſe Relations he had received of Q. *Mary*, from ſome of thoſe he had Occaſion to converſe with, but eſpecially from the Writings of *Buchanan*, which, otherwiſe, for the ſingular Beauty and Elegance of his Diction, he was ſo much enamoured with? Who theſe Papiſts were, who, as that great Man writes, agreed with *Buchanan* in the Accounts he gives of Q. *Mary*, he has not thought fit to inform us. They were probably Perſons of no great Character, and ſuch as knew nothing of the ſecret Springs and Machinery by which that black Tragedy was conducted. The principal Perſon among them, we learn, (from a Letter of *Caſaubon* to Monſieur *de Thou*, 26th *Feb.* 1612, and his Anſwer to it the 15th of the following *March*) was one Mr. *John Colvil*, as arrant a Villain as was in either Kingdom. This Man was indeed a Perſon of ſome Note (*a*), and of good Learning. He had been concerned in the E. of *Gowrie*'s Plot of making K. *James* a Priſoner, and afterwards an Accomplice in the Conſpiracies of that Arch-Traitor *Francis Stewart* Earl

(*a*) He was probably a Brother or near Relation of *James Colvil* of *Eaſter-Weems*, who we are ſure was an Accomplice in the Road of *Ruthven*, as it is called. Mention is frequently made of both in *Spotiſwood*, *Calderwood* and *Johnſton*'s Hiſtories.

Earl of *Bothwel*; till at laſt, upon the Diſcovery of theſe his wicked Practices, he was obliged to fly abroad, where, upon the Account of his Learning, and by the great Shew he made of Piety and Zeal for the Popiſh Religion, to which he pretended to have become a Convert, he found Means to inſinuate himſelf into Favour and Familiarity with Monſieur *de Thou*; and as he was always an Enemy both to K. *James* and his Mother, had the Cunning and Addreſs to perſuade that good Preſident to believe all the ill Things which *Buchanan* in his Hiſtory had writ of Q. *Mary*. For the Truth of all this, I appeal to the two Letters above mentioned, a Part of which I have given in the Appendix, No. II. and III. and to the Liſt of the Books written by the ſaid *Colvil*, which I have ſubjoined in the Margin (*a*).

Having ſaid thus much of the Authority upon which Preſident *de Thou* ſo greatly relied in that Part of his Hi-

 ſtory

(*a*) I. A Diſcourſe againſt K. *James* VI. his Title to ſucceed to the Crown of *England* after Q. *Elizabeth*. MS.

II. The Palinodie of *John Colvile*, quharin he doth penitentlie recant his formar provid Offenſis, ſpeciallie that treſonable Diſcourſe latelie maid by him againes the undouted and undeniabill Titill of his dread Soverane Lord *James* the ſext unto the Croun of *England*, after the Deceis of her Majeſtie preſant. MS. Fol.

III. *Paræneſis Joannis Colvilli Scoti [poſt quadraginta annorum errores in græmium ſanctæ catholicæ Romanæ eccleſiæ, quaſi poſtliminio reverſi] ad ſuos tribules & populares. Pariſiis*, 1601. 8vo.

IV. *Oratio funebris exequiis Elizabethæ, nuperæ Angliæ, Hiberniæ, &c. Reginæ, deſtinata. Pariſiis*, 1604. 8vo.

Theſe three laſt are in the Advocates Library, and the ſecond (in which that Author reviles himſelf in as bitter a Manner as any other could do) is a Proof of the firſt; [*tho'* Spotſwood *inclines to think, that this his firſt Treatiſe was a Fiction, in order to gain the greater Credit to the ſecond.*] And I leave it to the Reader to judge, what Credit was to be given to ſuch a wicked Perſon, and how much that Preſident was miſtaken in the good Opinion he had conceived of his Veracity. From his third Performance it appears he had wandered forty Years from one Religion to another, till at laſt he turned Papiſt, tho' it may, without a great Breach of Charity, be doubted whether he was all the while a Chriſtian. His fourth Piece is a high Panegyrick on Q. *Elizabeth*, writ after he had declared himſelf a *Roman Catholick*; when it is known that the Zealots of that Religion hate that Queen, to uſe the Poet's Words, *odio Vatiniano*, *i. e.* a moſt cruel and implacable Hatred,

ſtory relating to the Affairs of Queen *Mary*, I come next to conſider this Letter of his, on which the Vindicator lays ſo great Streſs. And in the firſt Place, it is proper we ſhould take ſome Notice of Mr. *Camden*'s Letter, to which that of *de Thou* is an Anſwer: As to which, I was once of Opinion that that Letter was loſt, it not being recorded among thoſe of that great Man publiſhed by Dr. *Smith*. And we are the more obliged to the Induſtry of that moſt learned and excellent Hiſtorian Mr. *Thomas Carte*, who has found it out, and given it a Place in the 7th Volume of the glorious Edition of Monſieur *de Thou*'s Hiſtories, which he, with an unparallel'd Application and Diligence, prepared for, and reviſed at the Preſs. This Letter of *Camden*, writ at *de Thou*'s earneſt Deſire, is dated at *London* 16th *April* 1605, a whole Year, and three Months and an half, before Monſieur *de Thou* made an Anſwer to it. That Part of it which relates to the Affairs of *Scotland* at the Period we are upon, I have ſet down in the Appendix, No. IV. And I cannot enough wonder, that that otherwiſe great and noble Hiſtorian *de Thou*, after what *Camden* (and that, as I ſaid, at his own Deſire too) had wrote him on that Subject, ſhould have perſiſted in his Miſtakes; but more eſpecially, that the Memoirs wrote by that learned and honourable Gentleman, and moſt curious and intelligent Searcher into Hiſtories and Antiquities of all Kinds, and more particularly into thoſe of the two *Britiſh* Kingdoms, Sir *Robert Cotton*, and which were put into *de Thou*'s Hands by K. *James*'s Order, were not ſufficient to make him change the ill Opinions he had conceived of our Q. *Mary*. It would ſeem that either he was ſo prepoſſeſſed in the miſtaken Notion he had of *Buchanan*'s Veracity, that he could not alter the Thoughts he had of theſe Matters; or, which is more probable, he thought it would be a Diſcredit to his Hiſtory, that in an after Edition of it, he ſhould repreſent Things quite otherwiſe than he had done in the former. But be thoſe Things as they will, this is certain that Mr. *Camden*, Sir *Robert Cotton*, and many others, who have wrote of thoſe Matters,

had

had vaſtly better Opportunity of knowing the Truth of them, than Monſieur *de Thou* could poſſibly have.

However, to come more cloſe to what is contained in his Letter, it were eaſy for me to ſhew the fallacious Reaſoning he uſes in every Part of it. But it will be ſufficient to overthrow the whole, that I touch at the chief Things he inſiſts on, which are theſe three: 1. The Letters ſaid to have been writ by Q. *Mary* to *Bothwel*. 2. Her marrying that Earl, who was ſuſpected to have had the chief Hand in the Murder of her former Huſband. And, 3. The general Opinion that Perſons of all Ranks are ſaid to have had of the E. of *Murray*'s ſingular Piety and Virtue. And,

1. As to theſe abominable Letters. which are ſaid to have been written by Q. *Mary* to the E. of *Bothwel*, on which the main Streſs of all the Accuſations againſt her is laid, it is ſufficient in this Place to aſſure the Reader, that it can be proved by an Evidence as clear and demonſtrative as a Matter of Fact is capable of, that they are nothing but a Heap of moſt baſe and flagitious Forgeries, firſt hatched and contrived, and afterwards ſolemnly ſworn to be true, by the ſame E. of *Murray*, and the other Ringleaders of that rebellious Faction; that by rendering that noble Princeſs odious to all the World, they might juſtify and accompliſh their own wicked Deſigns.

2. As to the Queen's marrying *Bothwel*: Beſides that that Earl was, in a moſt ſolemn Trial, by his Peers, the chief of the *Scottiſh* Nobility, abſolved from that Crime, there was a Bond made and ſubſcribed by a great Number of the ſame Nobility and others, and, among them, ſeveral of thoſe, who within leſs than two Months thereafter took up Arms againſt the Queen and ſaid E. of *Bothwel* for that Marriage. In this Bond they not only engage, " That they, with their Kin, Friends, and all
" who would take Part with them, ſhould avenge that
" Earl's Quarrel againſt all thoſe who ſhould accuſe him
" of the ſaid Murder: But alſo that they would uſe their
" utmoſt Endeavour to procure and ſet forward his Mar-
" riage with the Queen their Sovereign, and that they
" would hold and treat as Enemies all that ſhould go a-

" bout to hinder or oppoſe the ſame. To this their " Deed they not only take the great GOD to Wit- " neſs; but alſo, that in caſe they ſhould do any Thing " to the contrary, they declare themſelves to be account- " ed worthleſs and faithleſs Traitors for ever." May I not here put the Queſtion, what the Queen could do after ſuch a powerful Aſſociation? She was then but 24 Years of Age: She ſaw the Kingdom ſo divided into Factions, that ſhe could not know what Party to take up with, or which would beſt ſupport her in the Exerciſe of her Government: What could ſhe then do better, than to take for a Husband him whom ſo many of the chief Nobility had in the ſtrongeſt Manner recommended as the fitteſt Match ſhe could make in the whole Kingdom? Add to this, that, beſides that he was at that Time a Nobleman of a great and hitherto unblemiſhed Reputation, and inferior to none for Power and Intereſt in *Scotland*, unleſs perhaps the E. of *Huntly*; that beſides this, I ſay, he was a declared Proteſtant, and the Queen might thereby be induced to think that her Marriage with him would tend very much to recover the Good-will of a great Number of her Subjects, which her Religion had before much alienated from her. I know it will be ſaid, that all this notwithſtanding, ſhe ought not by any Means to have married him, who was ſuſpected to have had a chief Hand in her Husband's Murder. But not only he, but ſhe herſelf, and ſeveral others (*a*), were bruited and placarded as guilty of that Crime. She knew her own Innocence, and as he was acquitted of it in Judgment, ſhe had no Reaſon but to think that he was equally innocent. There were other Circumſtances that with me ſerve to vindicate the Queen's whole Conduct in that Affair, which it would be too tedious here to relate. I ſhall only

(*a*) *Buchanan* himſelf owns that the Earls of *Murray* and *Morton* were branded at the ſame Time, as acceſſory to that Murder. The Earls of *Huntly* and *Argyle* gave in a ſolemn Declaration of their Guilt to Q. *Elizabeth*, and it being proved of the latter, he was accordingly ſentenced to Death for it. And it is hardly to be doubted, from the Intimacy that was between them, but that the former was equally concerned in it.

only add, that all thoſe who in the keeneſt Manner puſhed on that Marriage, had the ſame and greater Grounds to ſuſpect *Bothwel* for the Murderer of her former Huſband, as ſhe herſelf could have; nay, that ſome of them, who were afterwards ſo wicked as to perſecute and dethrone her on that Account, were themſelves acceſſory to that Murder.

3. Come we then to the third and laſt Topick Preſident *de Thou* inſiſts on in his Letter, for juſtifying what he had wrote of Q. *Mary*, and that is, the high Eſteem and Veneration the E. of *Murray* was held in, as a Perſon of ſingular Piety and Virtue. But however much that Opinion might have prevailed, which yet was far from being ſo general as *de Thou* ſuppoſes, it is wholly and entirely deſtroyed by the firſt Article. For who that had the leaſt Grain of *Piety*, *Grace* or *Goodneſs* in him, could have been guilty of two ſuch black and atrocious Crimes as *Forgery* and *Perjury*, and that with a pre-meditated Intention to ruin his own Sovereign Lady and moſt bountiful Benefactreſs, with a View to get the chief Power in the Kingdom put into his own Hands, if not the Crown ſet upon his Head? He, it ſeems, in this, thought fit to imitate, one indeed in the Eye of the World the greateſt of Men, the firſt, and in ſome Reſpects the moſt glorious of all the *Roman* Emperors, *Julius Cæſar*; but with this Difference, that this laſt did not ſtand to ſpeak out what the other was at infinite Pains to conceal. For, as *Cicero* informs us, that Emperor had nothing more frequently in his Mouth, than thoſe *Greek* Verſes of *Euripides*, which that Author has thus rendered in *Latin*:

Nam ſi violandum eſt jus, regnandi gratiâ
Violandum eſt: aliis rebus pietatem colas.

But how wicked, how baſe and unworthy of a Man, much more of a Chriſtian, ſuch a Practice is, is ſo elegantly deſcribed by that ſame excellent Orator and Philoſopher, that I have thought fit to ſet down his Words in the Margin (*a*). And yet what Miſery, Ruin and Deſolation

(*a*) *Cadit ergo in virum bonum, mentiri emolumenti ſui causâ, criminari, præripere, fallere? Nihil profectò minus. Eſt ergo ulla res tanti, aut commodum*

ſolation ſuch pretended Saints, or rather Devils in Maſquerade, have brought upon Kingdoms and Nations, and on none more than our own in the two laſt Centuries, no Tongue is able to expreſs. For, not to mention innumerable others, ſuch an one was *Cromwel*, who being well inſtructed in that Machiavellian Maxim,

——— *Si vis fallere plebem,*
Finge Deum. ———

And having by that Phariſaical Art deluded the Multitude, at laſt arrived at that Pinacle of worldly Grandeur, which the other by the ſame Means was aſpiring at, and had well nigh attained.

I make no Doubt but that theſe Things will provoke the Vindicator's Indignation to a very high Degree, and that he will be ready to cry out, as he does concerning *Buchanan*, that what I have ſaid is *a moſt horrid and unwarrantable calumniating of that* godly Hero, the E. of *Murray*, who, by thoſe that did not ſee thro' the Mask, had got the Name of the Good Regent. But may not I take the ſame Freedom with the Character of that Earl, that he, *Buchanan*, the Vindicator himſelf, and many others, have taken with that of thoſe of far greater Quality; not to mention the groſs Calumnies and Reproches this Author has ſcattered through his whole Pamphlet, upon the Memory of many great and illuſtrious Perſons? What I have ſaid with reſpect to the forging of theſe abominable Letters, I am ready to make good at the Bar of any impartial Tribunal. And if ſo, may I not ſay with the Poet,

Accipe nunc Danaûm inſidias, & crimine ab uno
Diſce omnes.

For what Lies and Falſhoods would ſuch Men ſtick at, who

dum ullum tam expetendum, ut viri boni & ſplendorem & nomen amittas? Quid eſt quod afferre tantum iſta utilitas, quæ dicitur, poſſit, quantum auferre, ſi viri boni nomen eripuerit? fidem juſtitiamque detraxerit? Quid enim intereſt, utrùm ex homine ſe quis conferat in belluam, an hominis figurâ immanitatem gerat belluæ? Quid? qui omnia recta & honeſta negligunt, dummodo potentiam conſequantur, nonne idem faciunt quod is qui ſocerum habere voluit eum, cujus ipſe audaciâ potens eſſet, &c. Cic. Off. iii. 21.

who were capable of committing ſo monſtrous a Wickedneſs (*a*)?

But that I may not confine myſelf to that one Point, I could here produce many inconteſtable Proofs that ſhew the Conduct of that Earl and his Accomplices to have been of a-piece with this. But becauſe that would carry me far without due Bounds, I ſhall content myſelf with one, which, as it is a mighty Confirmation of what I have ſaid, I have put in the Appendix, No. V. It is a long Paper in the *Cotton* Library, *Titus* C. 12. containing *Inſtructions and Articles to be adviſed upon, and agreed, ſo far as the Queen's Majeſty* [of Scotland] *ſhould think expedient, at the Meeting of the Lords in* England, *&c.* In which (beſides thoſe of the *Spirituality*, ſome of whom had caſt off Popery) no fewer than 20 *Temporal* Lords, moſt of them Proteſtants, gave their unanimous Concurrence, atteſting on the one Side the Queen's Innocence, and on the other the complicated Wickedneſs of the E. of *Murray* and his Adherents, who had dethroned the Queen, and taken the Government into their own Hands. This is not a *Hear-ſay* or *ſecond-hand* Teſtimony, (ſuch as that of Monſieur *de Thou*, *Giov. Bapt. Adriani* (*a*), and the Writer of Cardinal *Laurea*'s Life;) but a Declaration of the moſt conſiderable Nobility of *Scotland*, who for the moſt Part were immediately concerned in the Tranſactions of that Time, and ſome of whom do, in this very Paper, themſelves confeſs, that they had been drawn into the ſame Plot, that the Earl of *Murray* and his Accomplices were carrying on.

But

(*a*) The Words of *Cicero*, *Orat. pro Roſcio Comœdo*, c. 16. *Quem ego ut mentiatur inducere poſſum; ut pejeret exorare facile potero. Nam qui ſemel à veritate deflexit, hic non majore religione ad perjurium, quàm ad mendacium, perduci conſuevit*; will hold more ſtrongly when inverted thus: *Quem ego, ut pejeret, inducere poſſum, ut mentiatur, exorare facile potero. Nam qui ſemel à veritate deflexit, hic non majore religione ad mendacium, quàm ad perjurium perduci conſuevit.*

(*b*) The Vindicator has brought in this *Italian* Author, P. 51. as confirming all the bad Things that are related of Q. *Mary*. But I have omitted to take any Notice of him; both becauſe he was a Foreigner, and that he vouches no Authority for what he ſays.

But to return back to the Vindicator: He, before he gives us that Letter of Preſident *de Thou*, has thought fit by the by to give me a Wipe for *overlooking, or rather*, ſays he, *for ſuppreſſing it in my Edition of* Buchanan's *Works*. That Letter of Monſieur *de Thou* to *Camden*, was wrote on 31ſt *July*, 1606, upwards of four Years and five Months before that of *Caſaubon* to *de Thou*, [dated 25th *Feb.* 1611;] which I have inſerted in my Preface. And it would be a ſtrange *Hyſteron proteron* to make a Letter that was written ſo many Years before, to be an Anſwer to that which was written ſo long after. But beſides, I would ask this Author, and others who I underſtand have accuſed me of that Omiſſion, where they would have had me to inſert that Letter of *de Thou*, which they make ſuch a Pother about? There were only two Places in which I could have had Occaſion to ſet down that Letter, *viz.* either in my ſaid Preface, or among the *Elogia* or *Teſtimonia* of learned Men concerning *Buchanan*'s Writings. In the former it could not, with any Propriety, have a Place; for in it I only deſigned to ſet down the Cenſures Men of Learning have paſt on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory, among which that Letter of *Caſaubon* to *de Thou* is one. But no body will ſay, that the Letter this Author is ſo much taken with, is of that kind. And as little could I inſert it among the *Elogia* of *Buchanan*: For his Name is but once mentioned in it, and that only by the bye, in theſe Words: *Rem, ut ex Scotorum, qui interfuerunt, ſermonibus didici, ita literis mandavi, et ad eorum fidem ſcripta à Buchanano expendi.* From which it would ſeem Monſieur *de Thou* truſted more to theſe *Scotſmen*, who he ſays were preſent when theſe Things which he above relates were tranſacted, than to *Buchanan*. Was it then neceſſary or requiſite, that I ſhould, for the Sake of that ſhort Sentence, bring in among the *Elogia* of *Buchanan* that long Letter, which the Vindicator blames me for *overlooking* or *ſuppreſſing*; eſpecially as every one that peruſes it will ſee it to be rather a Vindication of what he himſelf, than of what *Buchanan* had written? Had it been proper for me to have brought into my Preface or elſewhere Monſieur

ſieur *de Thou*'s Letters to *Camden*, *Caſaubon*, or others, and of theirs to him, on that Subject, I might have made a no ſmall Volume of them. But every body would have condemned my Want of Judgment had I done ſo. There is, however, another Letter of *de Thou* to *Camden*, writ 13th *April*, 1608, upwards of a Year and an half after the former, which might have ſeemed more pat to our Author's Purpoſe than that former one he has given us: For in it *de Thou* ſpeaks more directly of the Credit he gave to *Buchanan*, than in the other. His Words are: *Utinam quæ veſtra ſunt, & ad univerſam Britanniam ſpectant, pari compendio & ſimplicitate ſcripſiſſes*; [alluding to the ſhort Account *Camden* in his Letter 16th *April*, 1605, had given of *Scottiſh* and *Iriſh* Affairs; and then adding] *Sic enim factum eſſet, ut temperamentum, quod in Scoticis quidam a me forſan ſunt deſideraturi, tuis veſtigiis inſiſtens, facilius ſecutus eſſem, & in veſtratium Magnatum offenſionem, quam vitatam cupiebam, non incurriſſem. Sed cùm neminem haberem præter Buchananum, neceſſe mihi omnino fuit ſeriem illius tragicæ narrationis, per alios, eoſque religioni Proteſtantium minimè addictos* (a), *antea approbatæ, petere: ceterùm, omni infectatione omiſsâ, ne vel ſolâ vel nudâ mentione tam indignæ cædis ii exacerbentur qui adeo Buchanano infeſti ſunt.*" Thus he; and it had been more juſt in the Vindicator to have quarrelled my *overlooking* or *ſuppreſſing*, as he calls it, this ſecond Letter, than the former. But the Reaſon why he did not, ſeems to have been, becauſe Monſieur *de Thou* does not inſiſt ſo much on juſtifying the ill Things he had ſaid of Q. *Mary* in this ſecond Letter, as he has done in the former. But whatever is in this, I hope the Reader will be ſatisfied that there is no more Ground for blaming me for not inſerting that or any other Letter of *de Thou*, in my Edition of *Buchanan*'s Works, than there is for not bringing into it all that vile Scurrility and Ribaldry vomited forth againſt Q. *Mary* by *Knox*, *Spotſwood* the Superintendent, *Cal-*

(a) See what I have ſaid of thoſe above, P. 72. & 73.

derwood, Petrie, &c. and propagated by their Followers to this Day.

But, ſays the Vindicator, P. 77. "Some of thoſe "Things related by *Buchanan* of Q. *Mary*, were tranſ- "acted before K. *James* was born; others of them, "when he was *infans in cunis vagiens*, as Mr. *Ruddi-* "*man* ſpeaks; ſo that his Majeſty could know nothing "of theſe Affairs, *ex propria ſcientia*, and he muſt have "had them from ſome of his Court-Flatterers and De- "pendents." That there have been and ſtill are many Sycophants and Flatterers in all Courts, has always been a general and juſt Complaint. But it would go hard with ſovereign Princes, if among all their Miniſters and Counſellors they could find none that would give them a true and faithful Account of what at any Time had paſt in their Dominions. But is our Author ſure that no ſuch Sycophants had crept into the E. of *Murray*'s Court, and who, to gain his Favour, would ſpread ſuch Things as would beſt anſwer his ambitious Purpoſes? The Vindicator, however, is much miſtaken, if he thinks that K. *James* had his Information moſtly or chiefly from thoſe that were then about his Court. Some Intelligence indeed he might have from a few of thoſe that had been Counſellors to his Predeceſſor Q. *Elizabeth,* who were well acquainted with what had paſt in both Kingdoms in his Infancy and Childhood, and on whoſe Credit he had Reaſon to rely. But he had other, and vaſtly firmer Ground to go upon, namely the many original Documents, Letters and other Writings, which, notwithſtanding all their Arts to conceal them, laid open the hidden Wickedneſs of his Mother's Enemies. Theſe were written and drawn up at the Time by Perſons of the higheſt Quality, and others, who were moſt of them dead, and who then had not the leaſt Dependence on K. *James,* but rather the contrary. And had Monſieur *de Thou,* or even *Buchanan* himſelf, unleſs he was upon the Plot, any Thing comparable to theſe, and the Certainty that they afford? K. *James* aſſures us, *that he had ſeen, read, and diligently examined* theſe publick Records, and other Writings, and upon them he founds

founds the Evidence he had of his Mother's Innocence, and *Murray*'s Wickedneſs. And Thanks firſt to the Divine Providence, and next to the ſingular Induſtry of Sir *Robert Cotton*, that moſt of theſe invaluable Monuments have been hitherto carefully preſerved; as have alſo ſome others of the ſame kind that have ſince come to Light. Theſe ſpeak for themſelves, and are infinitely more to be regarded than what a thouſand *Buchanans*, or *de Thou's*, or any others, whether Proteſtants or Papiſts, ever could or can ſay on the Subject.

The Vindicator, ever ready to lay hold of an Opportunity where he may catch me napping, in his P. 84. is careful to obſerve that theſe *Animadverſions*, which I have ſubjoined to my Notes on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory, were not (as I ſuppoſed) written by Mr. *Camden* to *de Thou*, but that they were K. *James*'s Animadverſions, in the Hand-writing of *Iſ. Caſaubon*. This Obſervation the Vindicator owns he had from the Editor of *Buckley*'s Edition of *de Thou*'s Hiſtory, and ſo had I, as likewiſe from the Life of Sir *Robert Cotton*, prefixed to the Catalogue of that great Man's Library, both compoſed by Dr. *Smith*. As to that Miſtake of mine, which I acknowledge, and would have corrected if Occaſion had offered, all I ſhall ſay is, that as Dr. *Smith* has ſet down theſe *Animadverſions* in his *Appendix* to *Camden*'s *Epiſtles*, and as he does not there mention by whom they were written, I could hardly otherwiſe imagine than that *Camden* was the Writer of them. And it is the leſs to be wondered at, that I ſhould have fallen into that Error, when the late very learned and pious Dr. *Gibſon*, Bp. of *London*, had fallen into the ſame before me; who in the Life of Mr. *Camden*, prefixed to the Tranſlation of that Author's *Britannia*, with his Improvements, attributes theſe Animadverſions to him, as I have done, both in the firſt and ſecond Editions of that great Work, *anno* 1695, and 1721. But, as every Thing that comes from that Quarter is contemptible in the Eyes of this Author, he adds: "To "me, *ſays he*, it is a *lis de lana caprina*, whether theſe "Animadverſions be the King's, *Camden*'s or *Caſaubon*'s, "they are ſo trifling and mean." He ſhould have ſaid,

if he would have ſpoke to the Purpoſe, that they are *falſe*, and *contrary to Fact*: For if they are true, as it can be demonſtrated they are, they are far from being *trifling* or *mean*, ſince they flatly contradict that Maſs of Scandal and Reproach, which *Buchanan*, and after him *de Thou*, have thrown upon the Memory of Q. *Mary*. The only Fault they have is, that they are too ſhort, and are not carried forward to many other equally falſe Calumnies vented againſt that Queen by theſe Authors.

The Vindicator ends his Pamphlet as he had begun, with high Encomiums on *Buchanan*'s Hiſtory and Dialogue *de jure regni*, and with rude and unmannerly Reflexions on that Parliament, which within two Years after the Publication of the one, and five after that of the other, paſt a condemnatory Act upon both. He likewiſe falls foul upon two Prelates, Mr. *Patrick Adamſon*, Archbiſhop of *St. Andrews*, and Dr. *Nicolſon*, Biſhop of *Carliſle*, the one for *framing*, as he ſays, and the other for *approving* that Act. But nothing has raiſed his Indignation to ſuch a Pitch, as *the Decree of the Univerſity of* Oxford, anno 1683, which *appointed* Buchanan's *Dialogue, with others of the ſame Principles, to be publickly burnt*. But as theſe Things, and what he adds to the End of his Appendix, are quite foreign to the Purpoſe he and I have been upon, tho' I could ſay a great deal on the other Side, yet it would be very idle in me to meddle with a Controverſy, in which I never was directly concerned.

I have now done with this Author, and ſhall only add, by way of Concluſion, that tho' I have Reaſon to expect that he, after the Example of my other Opponents, will renew his Attacks upon me; yet that my after Silence may not be interpreted a Confeſſion that I have the worſt of the Argument, I here aſſure him and all others beforehand, that whatever he or they may hereafter publiſh againſt me, ſhall not provoke me to enter into any more Diſputes with them, of this or any other Kind. I have the Satisfaction of my own Conſcience, with regard to the ſeveral Cauſes which my Antagoniſts challenged me

to defend, that I have acted a fair and candid Part, and that, to the beſt of my Knowledge, I have not ſwerved from the eternal and immutable Laws of Juſtice and Truth. Having this Teſtimony in my own Breaſt, which it is not in the Power of all my Oppoſers to bereave me of, there is no Reaſon why I ſhould ſuffer the Quiet of my Mind to be troubled or diſconcerted by any of the bitter Railings, or other injurious Attacks, which I already have met with, or may hereafter ſuſtain on that Account. This being my fixed Reſolution, I ſhall end with the Words of the Poet :

Nunc arma defunctumque bello
Barbiton hic paries habebit.

F I N I S.

A P-

APPENDIX.

Number I.

From the Records of Privy Seal.

ANE Lettre maid to Maiſter George Buchquhannane, for all the Dayis of his Liffe, of the Gift of an zeirlie Penſioune of the Sowme of five hundred Pundis uſuale Money of this Realme, to be zeirlie uptakin be him, his Factoris and Servitouris in his Name, at twa Termes in the Zeir, Whitſounday and Martimes in Winter, be equale Portionis, of the reddieſt Fruittis and Emolimentis of the Abbay of Corſragwell, now vacand and being in hir Majeſtie's Handis throw the Deceis of Umquhile Maſter Quintene Kennedie laſt Abbot thairof. And, for Payment of the ſaid zeirlie Penſioun, aſſignis to him the haill Temporalitie of the ſaid Abbay, with the Place, Manſs, Orchardis, Mains, Woodis, Coilheuchis, and Pertinentis quhatſumevir pertaining thairto: With Power to him to ſet and rais the ſaid Temporalitie, outputt and imputt the Tennentis thairof, and utherwiſe to uſe the ſamyn als frelie in all Sortis as the ſaid Umquhile Abbote mycht have in his Liftyme. And gife the ſamyn ſall not be fundin ſufficient and aneuch for zeirlie Payment of the ſaid Soume of fyve hundredth Poundis, in that Caſe her Majeſtie aſſignis to him ſa mekle as he ſall inlaik of the ſaid Temporalitie of the reddieſt Teyndis and Fruitis of the Spiritualitie of the ſaid Abbaye, viz. of the Kirkis of Girvane and Kirk-Oſwald belangand thairto. And that the ſaid Lettre, &c.

At Halirudhous the nynt Daye of October, the Zeir of God, M. V^c. LXIV. Zeris.

Num-

Number II.

Ex epiſtola Gul. Camdeni ad Jac. Aug. Thuanum : *Exſt. Tom.* vii. *Hiſt. ejuſdem Thuani, ex edit. Sam. Buckley.*

——IN Scoticis jam impreſſis quid præſtare poſſum non video, omni tamen operâ & ſtudio præſto futurus ſum.

Anno 1566, cautè tibi incedendum eſt inter Comitem Moraviæ, Hamiltonium, Reginam, Regem, & partium ſtudioſos : medio tutiſſimè ibitur. Jacobus Comes Moraviæ, frater nothus Reginæ, & Hamiltonius dux Caſtri-Heraldi, regnum planè affectarunt ; hic jure hereditario, utique cui avia filia fuit Regis Jacobi II. ille elato animo, neſcio quæ ſponſalia inter patrem & matrem ſomnians, natalium defectum ſpecioſo reformatæ religionis obtentu, ſuis virtutibus & clientelis ſupplere ſperavit : uterque Reginam è Gallia reducem in cœlum tranſlatam libens lubenſque audiret ; uterque ſuâ ſpe inflatus Reginam à nuptiis arcere ſategit : ſed imprimis nothus ille, qui malis artibus Reginæ abdicationi & exilio viam præſtruxit, uſus Buchanano adminiſtro (Archiſollem (*a*) ad rebellionem excitandam Rex noſter ſubinde vocat) qui famoſis libellis Reginam inſectatus quamplurima falſa affinxit, ut illi non temere credas in iis quæ ad Moravium & Reginam ſpectant, in ceteris fidem utcunque mereatur. Regina juvencula, & nova regnandi, rebus ſecundis luxuriavit ; Rex juvenis nullo rerum uſu, credulus, plumâ & folio levior, nec ipſe ſibi conſulere, nec bene monenti parere novit, & cui arcana tacere admodum grave. Unde & Reginæ gratiâ excidit, & partium ſtudioſi illum inſidioſiſſimè tractârunt, & demum ſuſtulerunt. Regina noſtra Elizabetha hæc ſpectavit, & ſæpius Scotam commiſerata eſt ; ſed minus, quòd titulum & inſignia

(*a*) See that Name given him above, P. 31.

ſignia regni Angliæ uſurpaverat, & in eam Pontificii apud nos ſpem repoſuerant omnem. Hæc quæ prudentiores & æquiores apud nos propiùs à vero abeſſe credunt, verbo innuo : tu tuo utere judicio & penicillo.

Number III.

Ex epiſtola Iſ. Caſauboni ad Jac. Aug. Thuanum. *Ibid.*

ILluſtriſſime vir, juſſus ſum ante paucos dies à ſereniſſimo Rege ad majeſtatem ipſius proficiſci : non alia de cauſa, quam ut ea cognoſcerem, quæ de te ei Lutetiâ fuerunt ſignificata. Ille enim Anglus, qui hiſtoriæ Cottonianæ X. libros nuper ad te detulit, literas mox ad D. Cottonum dedit, quibus hæc narrabantur : " Non ſtatuiſſe te novam editionem librorum tuorum à te recognitorum, niſi poſt annos haud ſcio quam multos, " publicare ; quod multa adhuc priorum editionum penes typographum reſtarent exemplaria : tum autem " multa in miſſa a Rege hiſtoria invenire te, quorum fidem ſuſpectam haberes : eſſe enim Scotum neſcio quem, " nomine COLVILLUM, qui in dubium pleraque vocaret ; teque illi Scoto mirum quantum tribuere : quod " ſi Regis animo plane ſederet, id à te velle exigere, ut " quæ prius ſcripſiſti emendares ex hiſtoria Cottoniana, " profiteri te, non aliter id poſſe abs te impetrari, quàm " ſi Rex ipſe hoc à te exegiſſet, et ſuamet ipſius manu " auctor tibi credendi illa ſcribendique fuiſſet. *Addebat* " *etiam ille Anglus* : Vix ac ne vix quidem perſuaderi " tibi poſſe, Comitem Morræum, cujus in rebus Scoticis " multa mentio, alium fuiſſe quàm virum probum & " fidei & prudentiæ ſingularis, prout eſt a te deſcriptus." Hæc cum ſereniſſimus Rex ex Anglicis illius quem indicavi literis mihi recitâſſet, mirari ſe vehementer dixit, quid accidiſſet cur priorem ſententiam mutares : ſe namque idcirco novam hiſtoriam curâſſe ſcribi & ad te mitti, quia viſus es id expetere, neque recuſare quin veritatem

rerum

rerum geſtarum certiùs edoctus, tua corrigeres. Atque hic fidem meam Rex appellabat, meminiſſe jubens, quoties hoc ego ipſius majeſtati partim meâ ſponte, partim ex literis tuis, confirmâſſem. Imprimis verò demiratur ſereniſſimus Rex, plus apud te ponderis habere *paucos rebelles, proditionis reos & maculoſos transfugas*, quàm ſuum teſtimonium & Scotici regni univerſi. *Nihil enim*, aiebat, *ut verum credi cupio, quod non ſit certæ & exploratæ fidei apud omnes Scotiæ viros bonos & ſubditos fideles*. Buchanani hiſtoriam & id genus narrationes non à ſe primo damnatas, ſed juvene ſe, & vixdum decimum quartum vel quintum (*a*) annum agente, decreto parlamenti Scotici, uti vocavit, & hiſtoriam illam & libellum illum famoſum læſæ majeſtatis eſſe poſtulatos & damnatos: quod etiam ex eo poſſit intelligi, quia neque hiſtoria Buchanani, neque ſimilis ulla alia, in Scotia fuerit edita (*b*). Colvillis autem & ceteris hoc genus perduellibus, ſuis & glorioſiſſimæ matris ſuæ manifeſtis hoſtibus, fidem in iſtis rebus haberi, & quidem a te tantæ gravitatis & φιλαληθείας viro, id verò ſereniſſimus Rex indigniſſimo fert animo, & inſignitam in eo ſibi fieri injuriam interpretatur. Morræi ingenium & mores non æſtimat Rex ex incertis rumoribus, & frivolis conjecturis; ſed ex rebus geſtis, quarum veritas ſibi uni meliùs ſit comperta quàm cuiquam mortalium. Acta publica ſe cum cura inſpexiſſe, ſingula diligenter expendiſſe, nihil denique prætermiſiſſe, quo certiûs ad veri ſæpe in abdito latentis cubile perveniret.——Lond. iv. Kal. Martias, 1612.

(*a*) *Caſaubon* ſeems here to have miſtaken K. *James*'s Words: For that King could not but know that he was then going in the 18th Year of his Age: It ſhould therefore be *decimum ſeptimum vel octavum*; which likewiſe agrees better with the Word *Juvene* going before. See above, P. 41.

(*b*) Meaning, after that firſt Edition printed *anno* 1582, by *Alexander Arbuthnot*: For tho' there were ſeveral Editions of it publiſhed abroad, yet none were printed either in *Scotland* or *England* all K. *James*'s Time, and long after.

Number IV.

Part of a Letter of Monſieur *de Thou* to Mr. *Caſaubon*, in Anſwer to the former. *In French. Ibid.*

—QUant a ce que je lui dis de Colville, ce n'eſtoit en intention qu'il fiſt entendre par dela; & ne fuſt autre choſe, que deſireux de ſçavoir d' un homme, qui ne devoit vrayſemblablement favoriſer la memoire du comte de Morrei, à cauſe de la haine de la religion, s'il eſtoit ſoubçonné en Eſcoſſe d'avoir participé au parricide, je le priay de me dire ce qu'il en ſçavoit, & je crois que deſlors je vous le dis. Cela ne meritoit d'eſtre reſcrit a S. M.———De Paris, 15 Mars, 1612.———*i. e.* —— As to what I ſaid to him (*a*) concerning *Colvil*, it was not with an Intention that it ſhould be made known on that Side; and was no other than this, that being deſirous to be informed by a Man, who could not probably favour the Memory of the Earl of *Murray*, becauſe of the Hatred he bore to the Religion, if he was ſuſpected in *Scotland* to have had a Hand in the Parricide, I prayed him to tell me what he knew of the Matter; and I believe I have ſince told you of it. That ought not to have been wrote back to his Majeſty.

Num-

(*a*) This Gentleman was one Mr. *Pory*, who was employed to carry over Sir *Robert Cotton*'s Memoirs, mentioned in the preceeding Letter, to Monſieur *de Thou*. He, in a Letter to Sir *Robert*, had communicated what that Preſident had ſaid to him on that Occaſion; which Letter Sir *Robert* put into K. *James*'s Hands. This is what *de Thou* here complains of, as does alſo Mr. *Pory* in another Letter to Sir *Robert*; a Copy whereof, both in *Engliſh* and *French*, is inſerted immediately after.

Number V.

Inſtructions and Articles to be adviſed upon, and agreed ſa far as the Queen's Majeſty our Soverain ſall think expedient, at the Meeting of the Lords in *England*; committit in Credit by the Noblemen, Earls, Lords, Biſhops, Abbots, Barons, and uthers, her Grace's trew and faithful Subjects of the Realme of *Scotland*; ſic as,

The Earles of *Huntly*, *Argyle*, *Crawfurd*, *Eglinton*, *Caſſils*, *Rothes*, *Errol*.

Lords, *Ogilvy*, *Fleming*, *Summervile*, *Boyd*, *Livingſton*, *Sanquhar*, *Yeſter*, *Herreis*, *Oliphant*, *Drummond*, *Salton*, *Maxwel*.

Biſhops, *St. Andrews*, *Dunkell*, *Aberdeen*, *Roſs*, *Galloway*, *Brechin*, *Argyle*, *Iſles*.

Abbots, *Jedburgh*, *Kinloſs*, *St. Colme*, *Glenluce*, *Fern*, *New Abbay*, *Halywood*, *Lyndores*.

To noble, wiſe and expert Men, an Reverend Father in God, *John* Biſhop of *Roſſe*, *Rob.* Lo. *Boyd*, *Wm.* Lo. *Livingſton*, *Jo.* Lo. *Herreis*, *Jo. Gordon* of *Lochinvar*, Kt. Commiſſioners electit and choſen thereto.

FIrſt, To declare that the Noblemen of this Realm (true and faithful Subjects to their Soverain) laments heichly the Pretence of certain particular Perſons within

the ſame, wha, being only movit with Ambition and unquiet Spirits, hes contrair all Reſſon, Lawes and gud Order, uſurpit the Authority, impriſonit our Soverain, and done that Thing that lies in them that her Grace's Authority and Power to reign ſuld ceiſs wlthin this Realme, to the evil Exampil of all other Princes; and yet thei who hes interpriſit the ſame are not in Number the ſaxt Part of the Nobility nor of the People of the Realme, and thei ar 6 or 7 Earles, who hes Vote in Parliament before any of them who hes uſurpit this Place; ſuppois with ſic treaſonabil and deceitfull Moyennis they have obtained the Strengths of the Countrie, by great Buddis and Rewardis given to Traytors Keepers thereof, to deceive their native Princeſſe and Maiſtreſs, render her Grace's Strengths and Jewels in their Hands, whilk hes been the Occation that the People adjacent thereabout was made obedient in an Manner to them, and in ſpecial the Burroughs; ſwa that the Prince being halden in Captivity in ſtrait Priſon in *Lochleven*, whilk could not be win in reſpect of the Strength and Situation thereof; and als thei had the hail Munition put in their Hands, be ſic Buddis and treaſonabil Deceit, as is knawin. And in Caſe the Noblemen Favourers of her Majeſtie had raiſit an Army to that Effect, it was menaſſit and boaſted that they ſuld ſend her Heid to them, likeas her Deid was oftimes pronouncit, concludit and ſubſcribit by an gryt Part of her Takers; and for Safety of her Hieneſs Lyff, her Majeſtie's Favourers ceiſſit to put themſelves in Armour againſt them, and contenit the Country in ſome Quietneſs, yet not without great Grief of Conſcience, quhil God of his ſpecial Providence relevit her Grace out of ſic ſtrait Priſon. Incontinent after her Hieneſs Relief, all the moſt Part of the Noblemen and haill People aſſiſtit to her Grace, and ſa mony as were upon ſa ſhort Knowledge convenit, with free Heart aventurit and warrit themſelves in her Grace's Quarrel, quhil it chancit by Battel to be invadit by the ſaid Uſurpers, wha ſtoppit her Paſſage to *Dumbartan*, whair her Majeſty was bound for Safety of her Lyff allenarly, to the Time that the hail Force of her Grace's Favourers might have been convenit,

where-

wherethrow her Majeſty was conſtranit to ſeek for Relief at the Queens Hieneſs of *England*'s Hands; and therefore all her Grace's true and faithful Subjects of the Realme deſires effectuouſlie the Queen's Majeſty of *England* to have Regard to her Grace's Cauſe and Proceedings thereof, and that of her princely Power ſhe wald reſtore our Soverain in her awin Realme with her Hieneſs Support; and likeas the ſame tends not only to the Prejudice of our Soverain allenarly, but to all Princes to be oppreſſit by their Subjects, ſwa it would pleis her Hieneſs to regard the ſame; whilk gif her Grace dois, will procure the hearty Luif of all true *Scottiſmen*; utherwiſe it may be prejudicial to her Hieneſs and all Princes to ſuffer ſic Inconvenients come in Practiſe: And als to require all Strengths to be rendred to the Queen's Majeſtie and Owners thereof, with all Jewellis, Munition and Re-apparelling thereof, and free delivering of the Noblemen, wha are halden and detenit in Captivity by the Earl of *Murray* and his Complices, to be diſchargit, and Guds and Geir reſtorit whilks has been takin from them; and that they deſiſt fra uſurping of all Authority in Time to come, and Security to be made thereupon.

2*dly*, It is to be diligentlie adviſit, in caſe our Soverain be adviſit to underly the Judgment of the Queen of *England*, and to have the Difference betwix her Grace and her Subjects tryit, admittand the Queen of *England* as Judge, it is to be reſonnit with our Soverane, that the ſame appeareth to be very hurtful and prejudicial to her Hieneſs, becauſe her Grace being an free Princeſs, having Imperial Crown, therefore is ſubject to na uther Prince in Erd, nor can nocht be judged by them, and therefore by Order of Tryal and Judgment, her Grace's Cauſe is not to be ſubmittit on that Manner: Zit not the leſs in reſpect of her Hieneſs honeſt, juſt and righteous Cauſe, and of her gud and clene Conſcience in all Proceedings, we are aſſurit her Grace will not refuſe in Preſence of great Princes to declare her honourable Part in all their Cauſes inventit calumniouſly againſt her Grace; providing always they be not admittit Judges to her Hieneſs; not for Fear of any Decreit may be given againſt her Majeſty,

jeſty, but only of the Prejudice may be engendrit to all other Princes in Time coming, throw ſic Practick, gif it cum in Uſe. But in caſe it be our Soverane's Pleaſure to hear her Cauſes reſſonit in Preſence of the Queen of *England*, or any her Grace's Commiſſioners appointit thereto, ze ſall uſe thir Reſſouns, Anſwers and Defences, to be reformit, eikit or changit, alwayes be our Soverane's Advice, as follows.

3*dly*, Gif the Subjects Uſurpers of our Soverane's Authority will alledge and object for Colour and Defence of their wickit and unjuſt Proceedings, that their Enterpriſe was upon the juſt deſerving of our Soverain, by Reſſoun of the Suſpicion had againſt her Hieneſs for her alledgit Conſent to the Murder of her Husband; ze ſall anſwer and declare that they can pretend no Colour of Defence by that Way to their Proceedings, becauſe the hail Progreſs of their Uſage in Times paſt, continually ſince the Queen's Arrival in *Scotland*, has declarit the Effect of their Meaning, whilk principally was groundit upon twa Cauſes; the one for the furth ſetting of the Religion, and the other for the Puniſhment of the Murder of the King: Suppois it is evident, the ſame has nocht been their principal Intention, but rather to aſpire to the hieſt Place and Government of the Realme. For it is maiſt true that our Soverane has never meant any Alteration of Religion whilk her Grace found ſtanding at her firſt arriving, but has appointit the Miniſters Stipends whair than they had none of before.

And further, the Queen's Majeſty, by Adviſe of the three Eſtates of her Grace's Realme, ſatisfyit the Deſire of the hail Nobility, by an Act of Parliament made concerning all the Points of the Religion, in the Parliament halden at *Edinburgh* the 15th Day of *April*, 1567, as the ſame proports at Length.

And as to anſwer the other Part, it is to be diligently and adviſitly remembrit and conſiderit how ſhortly after our Soverain's Home coming frae the Realme of *France*, in *Scotland*, the Earl of *Murray*, having Reſpect then (and as apperis yet by his Proceedings) to place himſelf in the Government of this Realme, and to uſurp this

King-

Kingdom, by his Counſale cauſit the Queen's Majeſty become ſwa ſubject unto him, as her Grace had been an Pupil, in ſic Sort that her Hieneſs Subjects had not Acceſs unto her Grace, to propone their awin Cauſes, or to reſaif Anſwer thereof, but by him only; ſwa that he was only recognoſcit as a Prince, and her Majeſty but a Shadow; and wha preiſit to find Fault with his Abuſes, he did purſue them with ſic Cruelty, that ſome of the principal Men he cauſit put to Deid, deſtroying their Bairns, Houſes and Memory, and cauſit uthers be baniſhit the Realme, and put uther Noblemen in Preſoun, and detainit them there; and having the Principals thus deject it of their Places, he proponit to the Queen's Majeſty to have the Crown tailzeit, and himſelf to have the firſt Place, quhilk her Grace plainlie refuſit, alledging ſhe would not defraud the richteous Heirs, and als feirit thereby the wrecking of herſelf, and ſecluding of her Grace's Succeſſion; in reſpect the Deſyrer of the ſaid Tailzie would never conſent any way that her Majeſty ſould marry any ſic Prince as made Suit at her Hieneſs tharefore, colouring the ſame upon the alledging of mony Inconvenients that micht follow upon the Marriage of gryt Princes; whilk her Majeſty partly conſiderit to be of Truth: And ſwa by the common Inclination of all Princes, and other Women, whilk rather deſyres to aſcend nor deſcend, for retaining the Realme at Liberty, and to be thrallit to na utheris, was content to dedaigne her Hieneſs to accept the Lord *Darnly* to her Husband, thinkand therethrow to obtain greateſt Favours of all them of that Surname. But the contrair is knawen, and what Impediment was made thereto by the ſaid Deſyrer of the ſaid Tailzie, wha by himſelf and his Aſſiſters conſpirit the Slauchter of the ſaid Lord *Darnly*, being then appointit to be marryit with her Grace, and als of his Fader and diverſe other Noblemen being in her Grace's Company and Followers at that Time, and ſo to have impriſonit her Hieneſs ſelf in *Lochleven*, and deteinit her Grace there all the Days of her Life, and he to have uſurpit the Government: Whilk Conſpiracy was near put in Execution in the Moneth

neth of *June* 1565, at the Kirk of *Baith*, as many wha was in Counſell with him (and drawn ignorantly thereon) can teſtify (*a*). And he ſeeing the ſame revelit drew ſundrie to his Opinion, under Colour of Religion, wha were baniſhit with him, and tuik Refuge in *England*. And thereafter he perſaving that they would not ſtay the Marriage, and als that it pleiſit God that her Grace was abil to have Succeſſion, and ſwa being great with Child, they inventit the Slauchter of her Majeſtie's Secretar in her Hieneſs Preſence, and cruellie performit the ſame, and held her maiſt noble Perſon in Preſoun, entendand by that Way the Death of her Majeſty throwout heich Diſpleaſure, ſecluding of her Succeſſion, and als of her ſaid Husband, be Reſſoun he was ſeducit to conſent thereto. But then ſeeing that her Grace with the Pleaſure of God did eſcape their Hands, and relief herſelf of Preſon, whairthrow that the Doers thereof was baniſhit for their Enterpriſe, and als heiring of the zoung Behaviour (throw fulage Counſel) of her ſaid Husband, they cauſit make Offers to our ſaid Sovereign Lady, gif her Grace would

(*a*) The chief Perſons engaged in that Conſpiracy were the Duke of *Chaſtelherault*, the Earls of *Argile* and *Murray*, who were afterwards joined by the Earls of *Glencairn* and *Rothes*, the Lords *Boyd* and *Ochiltree*, *Gawin* Commendatar of *Kilwinning*, Sir *William Kircaldy* of *Grange*, and a great many other Gentlemen and Magiſtrates of Burghs. They were favoured at firſt by that brave Nobleman *Jo. Maxwel* of *Terrigles*, called Maſter of *Maxwel*, and afterwards Lord *Herries*. Their chief Motive was, the Danger ſome of them thought, and others pretended, their Religion would be in by the Queen's Marriage with a Papiſt, the Lord *Darnly*, as well as his Father and Mother being known to be of that Religion. But the greater Part of them, having no Deſign to offer Violence to the Queen's Perſon, nor to carry Things to that Extremity that the E. of *Murray* and his ſpecial Aſſociates intended, ſoon after made their Peace with the Queen, and (as appears by this Deed) became moſt ſtrenuous Defenders of her Cauſe. And had it not been for the powerful Aſſiſtance that was given to the adverſe Party by the Queen of *England*, they would have ſoon reſtored their Sovereign to her Throne. But that Queen, inſtead of ſupporting Q. *Mary*, as ſhe had promiſed, proved her moſt cruel Enemy, and after 18 Years cloſe Confinement of her, at laſt cauſed execute that bloody Sentence againſt her, which was long before intended by ſome of her own moſt wicked Subjects. So that we may not unfitly apply to Q. *Elizabeth* and her Miniſters, what was ſaid of Pope *Urban* viii. and his Nephews: *Quod non fecere Barbari, fecere Barberini.*

wald give Remiſſioun to them that was baniſhit at that Time, to find Cauſes of Divorce, outher for Conſanguinitie, in reſpect they alledgit the Diſpenſation was not publiſhed, or elſe for Adultery, or then to get him convict of Treſoun, becauſe he conſentit to her Grace's Retention in Ward, or what utherwayes to deſpeache him: Whilk altogether her Grace refuſit, as is manifeſtly knawin, ſwa it may be cleirlie conſiderit, and is a ſufficient Preſumption in thir Reſpects, her Grace having the Commodity to find the Means to be ſeparit, and yet would not conſent thereto, to appear that her Grace would never have conſentit to his Murther, havand ſic uther likely Means to have been made quit of him by the Lords own Device. But that may be inferrit, that they were the Doers thereof only, as was deponit by them wha ſufferit deid therefore, wha declarit at all Times the Queen our Sovereign to be innocent thereof.

And whair they alledge her Grace is found guilty thereof, by Act in Parliament halden by them, it is to be anſwerit, there was nathing done in thair Parliament that might prejuge the Queen's Honour in any ſort, her Grace never being callit nor accuſit thereof. For what was done, it was not to declare her Grace guilty of ony Crime, whilk of Reſſoun na ways could be done contrare her Majeſty uncallit; but only an Act made for Safety of themſelves fra Forfalture, wha treſſonablie pat Hands in her Majeſties noble Perſon, empriſonit her Grace, allenerly foundand their Proceedings upon juſt Meaning as they alledgit; whilk ſundry Noblemen that was her Grace's Favourers (then preſent) buir withall, maiſt principally for Safety of her Grace's Life, whilk or their coming to Parliament was concludit and ſubſcribit by an gret Part of her Takers, to be taken fra her in maiſt crewel Manner, as is notourly knawin; ſuppois ſundry of the Noblemen Partakers with themſelves refuſit to ſubſcribe the ſame, or conſent to her Deid in ony Wayes.

And in caſe ony ſic Act had been made, the ſame cannot prejudge her Majeſtie in ony Sort, in reſpect they had na lauchfull Power to hald Parliament; and als it is

againſt all Lawis and Reſſoun to condemn ony Creature on Life, while they be firſt callit to uſe their lauchfull Defence, or at leaſt preſentit in Judgment and heard.

And ſicklike it is againſt all Lawis and Reſſoun, and als it was never ſeen in Practes that ever the Subjects war Judges of the Prince, but ſuld alwayes obey them; zea albeit thai be wickit, as the Scripture declaris. And it is of Truth, as zou cannot deny, that her Majeſty, immediately after her taking, divers Times was content to admit the hail Nobility and three Eſtates of the Realme Juges, her Hieneſs alwayes being heard to declare her awin Part in their Preſence, quhilk altogether was refuſit.

Swa every Man may perſave their hail Suit is according to their firſt Pretence, to ſeclude her Grace, and her Succeſſion of her Body, and alſo them of Line, as the uſing of my Lord Duke and his Friends inſtantly declaris.

And gif it beis alledgit, that her Majeſties Writing producit in Parliament ſuld pruiff her Grace culpable, it may be anſwerit that there is na plane Mention maid in it, by the whilk her Hieneſs may be convict, albeit it were her awin Hand Write, as it is not, and als the ſame is deviſit by themſelfis in ſome principal and ſubſtantious Clauſes; and ſic alledgit privy Writings can make na Probation in criminal Cauſes, whilk will be clearer nor the Licht of the Day, and ſwa by the ſaid Writing nathing can be inferrit againſt her Majeſty.

And in caſe it be alledgit, that the marrying of the Earle *Bothwel* is an great Suſpicion of her Hieneſs Knawledge; It is anſwerit, that before that ever that Marriage was laid to her Grace's Charge, the maiſt Part of the Nobility, and principally of the Uſurpers, ſic as the Earle *Morton*, Lord *Sempil*, Lord *Lindſey*, and Mr. *James Balfour*, gave their Conſent to the Earle *Bothwel*.

And to remoif all Suſpicion, whairthrow he micht be abil thereto, thai declarit him innocent of that Crime by an publick Aſſize, and cleangit him by an Rollement thereof, and the ſame was ratified again in Parliament by Conſent of the three Eſtates; and ſwa the ſame can infer na Preſumption againſt her Majeſty.

And

And farther, in Teſtification of her Grace's Innocency, and that her Conſcience does perſuade herſelf to abide all Tryal, her Hieneſs has randerit hir maiſt noble Perſon within the Realme of *England*, where his Fader, Moder and principal Freinds make Reſidence, havand ſpecial Commodity to ſuit Tryal thereof, whilk, gif her Grace had knawin herſelf guilty, wald not of her awin free Motion have come therein: Zit not the leſs her Grace, being an free Princeſs, is not ſubject to the Judgment of any other Prince.

And farder, it is of Trewth that her Adverſaries, Uſurpers of her Authority, offerit Remiſſion to ſundry that are convict for that Crime, by thame, gif thai would ſay that her Grace was guilty thereof, but offeris to pruif the Seducers culpable thereof in whatſumever Manner thai pleis.

Item, Gif it beis proponit that our Soverane Lady the Queen's Majeſty has renouncit her Crown, and all Tytil thereof, and that the ſame was ratifiet in Parliament;

To that it may be anſwerit, the Dait and Place thereof declare the ſame to be made, her Grace beand in Preſoun, and ſwa by Law is of nane Avail, albeit her Hieneſs had not been compellit thereto, likeas her Grace was indeed, as was declarit and verifiet by *Robert Melvil*, the Time of her Hieneſs being in *Hamilton*, after her Grace was eſchapit furth of Ward, wha affirmit ſolemnly that he came to the Queen's Majeſty to *Lochleven*, immediately before the ſaid alledgit Dimiſſion, ſent and directit furth of *Edinburgh* fra the Earle of *Athole*, the Secretar, and others Partakers in that Cauſe, and adverti-ſed her Grace that it would be laid to her Charge to renounce her Crown; and gif her Grace did not the ſame, ſhe would be put ſhortlie to Death. Therefore their Counſale was expreſly to obey their Deſire for her Safety; and ſwa her Majeſty had juſt Cauſe of Feir: For thai affirmed the ſame could do no Hurt to her Hieneſs Richt afterwart. And ſwa how ſone her Grace was releiffit, revoked the ſaid Dimiſſion in Preſence of her No-

 bility,

bility, and maid Faith ſhe was compellit thereto upon Feir of her Lyfe.

And as to the Ratification thereof in Parliament by the Eſtates, the ſame proceeded upon an wrangous Ground, whilk was Compulſion of our Soverane to renounce the ſame, likeas ſundry of the Lords maid Reſouns upon the Articles yet unreſolved, notwithſtanding the whilk it was concludit on their Manner the ſame to be ratifieit. And ſundry of the principal Noblemen, ſic as the Earles of *Huntlie*, *Argyle* and Lord *Herries* in ſpecial, at that Time took Inſtruments that thai conſentit not to that Dimiſſion, but in ſa far as it ſtude with her Grace's free Will, and gif her Majeſty wald abyde at the ſame afterwart, and not utherwayes; and in caſe thereafter it were found that her Grace was compellit, or did the ſame upon juſt Feir, that thai ſould be free of their Conſent, as the ſame had never been given, and all that followed thereupon to be null; albeit her free Conſent was affirmit by ſundry there preſent, with many ſolemnit Aithes, by ſome Lords, and Inſtruments of Notars declaring the ſame; ſuppoſe the contrare be of Verity, whilk ſall be verifieit by Inſtruments taken in their Parliament, or by ſingular Battel as thai pleis. And attour this Renunciation was but privately geven, and als privately admittit by an few Number of them only wha pat Hands in her Grace, and not in any Parliament; and als the King was crownit by the ſame Number, and their Regent on their Manner admittit, and ſwa all that followit thereupon can have na Place.

Item, In caſe certain Articles be proponit to be reſſonit and condeſcendit unto betwex our Soverain and the Realme of *England*, it is thocht gud by the Nobility of this Realme, that are trew and faithful Subjects to their Soverain the Queen's Majeſty, to condeſcend unto all that may ſtand to the Honor and Glory of God, maintaining of Tranquillity, Peace, Amity and mutual Concord betwixt thir twa Realmes, and the Commonweils thereof, providing the Queen's Majeſty our Soverain be reſtorit and reponit freely in her awin Realme with all Reverence, and to her princely Honour and Government of

the

the ſame, in ſic Wayes that the Lawes thereof be obſervit and keipit, the Liberty thereof maintained, and our ancient Friendſhip and Amity with our auld Friends and Confederates unviolated; and furder ye ſall condeſcend ſa far as our Soverain ſall think fit for the preſent.

Item, In caſe it be deſirit towart the Government of the Realme, that the Queen's Majeſty our Soverain act by the Advice of her Counſale of the Nobility, it is thocht guid and reſſonabil that her Grace do the ſame, and that her Hieneſs chooſe her Counſale of the wiſeſt and maiſt expert of the Nobility of the Realme, likeas her Hieneſs Predeceſſors hes done at all Times paſt, and to do all Things concerning the Government of the Realme, and Weil thereof by their Advice: Otherwayes if her Majeſty were conſtrainit to uſe the Counſale only of ſic as certane her Subjects wald choiſe unto her, the ſame ſuld make her Grace to be in perpetual Thraldome to them; whilk is not only prejudicial to her Hieneſs, but als to all Princes, and contrair all Cuſtomes and Lawes of the Realme of *Scotland*. Alwayes what her Grace thinkes to be done thereintill by your Advice, ye ſal find guid.

Item, As to the Religion, ſuppoſe the Matter be weighty in itſelf, to conſtraine Mens Conſcience, yet after Reſſoning heard thereintill, what beis thought guid by our Soverain and you, we will condeſcend thereunto.

Item, As to the ancient League of *France*, it has ſtand lang amang us, and appearandlie it cannot agree with the Honour of this Realme to break the ſame; yet ſa far as may ſtand with our Honours and Weil of this Realme, we are content to retein Friendſhip with *England*, and to contract thereupon as our Soverain ſall think guid, and als to reſaif na Strangers (to the Prejudice of the Realme of *England*) within our Realme in any ſort.

Item, As to our Soverain's Title to *England*, we underſtand our Soverain the Queen's Majeſty buir ever that Luif and Favour towart her Siſter the Queen of *England*, that ſuppoſe it had ſtand in her Power to have moleſtit her Majeſty in her Time, yet would not ſhe do the ſame, nor intends (as we underſtand) to do in Time coming.

And now, ſeeing the Queen's Hieneſs of *England* is ſo beneficial to our Soverane, ſhe thinks her Grace meikle mair addettit nor of before; and therefore it being our Maiſtreſs Pleaſure and Will, finds that Part guid to be condeſcendit unto for the Weil of baith the Realmes, and that all Occation of Trouble be removit, or Suſpition in Time coming; that our Soverain ſall not moleſt the Queen of *England*, nor her lauchfull Succeſſion of her Body, without Prejudice of our Soverain's Title thereafter: In like Manner the Queen's Grace of *England* ſall do nathing in her Time may be prejudicial to our Soverane's Title after the Queen of *England*'s Deceaſe; and to require, gif it be her Grace's Pleaſure, to declare for that Favour to our Soverain, in her awin Time, when it ſall pleis her Hieneſs to be moovit thereto.

Item, As to the puniſhing the Queen's Husband's Murtherers, the ſame to be execute upon the Perſons who has juſtly deſerved the ſame, as Law and Reſſoun will permit.

Item, Whatever beis condeſcended unto, the Lords promiſes to ratifie and appruif the ſame, and ſall conſent thereto in the firſt Parliament that beis halden by our Soverain Lady within the Realme of *Scotland*, and upon their Lyves and Honours ſall ſet forward the ſame in Time coming, and gif Order beis required, to condeſcend thereto, as the Queen's Majeſty our Soverane by your Advice ſall think guid.

Item, Ye ſall not fail at your firſt Reſſoning to expound and declare hiely the Proceedings in this laſt their pretendit Parliament, to the Forfalture of ſundry Noblemen, and als that thai dayly continew putting at the Queen's Grace's true Favourers, by Charge of their Houſes, lifting of Pains for Abſence, and troubling them utherwayes, notwithſtanding that we have deſiſtit at our Soverain's Deſire, by the Queen of *England*'s Requeſt: And therefore to require the Queen of *England*, according to her Promiſe, that haſty Order be put thereto, that her Grace's Requeſt be eſteemed mair weighty in Time coming, nor it has ſeemit at this Time, and therefore has juſt Cauſe to employ Forces for Reſtitution of our

Soverain in her awin Realme, whilk ye ſall maiſt earneſtly require before all uther Things.

Item, To remember amangis uther Informations, that the principal Cauſe firſt ſet furth by the Uſurpers, wherefore they put themſelves firſt in Armes, was to put the Queen's Majeſtie's maiſt noble Perſon to Liberty furth of the Earl *Bothwel*'s Hands, and to puniſh him for the violent taking and raviſhing of her Hieneſs, and puniſhing him for her Husband's Slauchter; and yet has proceedit farther, as is notourly knawin, to the uſurping of the Authority.

Thir are the principal Heids and Articles whilk we preſentlie have in Heid for the Weil of our Soverain's Service, and Advancement of her Grace's Affairs, to be ſichtit, concludit, and ſet forwart by the Queen's Majeſty, or reſſonit at her Hieneſs Pleaſure by the Advice of the Commiſſioners foreſaids. Subſcribit with our Hands at *Dumbartan* reſpective, the 12th Day of *September*, 1568 *. Subſcribit thus:

Jo. Archbp. of *St. Andrews.*	*Argyle.*	*Huntly.*
Eglinton.	*Caſſils.*	*Crawford.*
Fleming.	*Maxwel.*	*Errol.*
Glenluce.	*Laur.* Lo. *Oliphant.*	*Ja.* Lo. *Ogilvy.*
Sanquhar.	*Dav.* Lo. *Drummond.*	*Sommervile.*
Roſſe.		*Yeſter.*

On the Margin is this Note: *My Lord Biſhop of* Roſſe, *Lo.* Livingſton, Boyd, Herries *and* Kilwinning, *ſubſcribit not thir Articles, nor the Commiſſion, becauſe they were appointed Commiſſioners, and accepted the ſame.*

POST-

* This Copy is taken from that wrote by the Hand of Mr. *Matthew Crawfurd*, late Profeſſor of Church-hiſtory in the College of *Edinburgh*, and I have followed his Spelling, tho' I have Reaſon to believe that in many Places it is not the ſame with that of the Original. I alſo ſuſpect thrt there are ſome ſmall Omiſſions and Miſtakes in it.

POSTSCRIPT.

ALtho' from the above Inſtructions it plainly appears what was the Senſe of the Nation with reſpect to the barbarous Treatment Q. *Mary* met with from the E. of *Murray*, and his rebellious Adherents; yet becauſe Bp. *Burnet*, in the ſupplemental Volume he has added to his Hiſtory of the Reformation, P. 328. and 329. and Mr. *Anderſon*, in the 2d Vol. of his Collections concerning that Queen, would make the World believe that the greater Part of the People approved what that Faction had done, and that they proceeded rather upon *national than religious Grounds*, I have thought it not amiſs to conſider what they advance on that Head.

The chief Topick on which their Aſſertion is founded, is a Bond entred into and ſigned by above 200 of the moſt eminent Families of the Kingdom, in which "they promiſe and bind themſelves to aſſiſt their King "in ſetting him on the Throne, and putting the Crown "on his Head; and that they ſhould give their Oaths of "Homage with all dutiful Obedience to him, as became "true Subjects; and ſhould concur in eſtabliſhing him "in his Kingdom, and reſiſt all ſuch as ſhould oppoſe "it." Theſe are a Part of the Words of that Bond; but how little Streſs is to be laid upon it, will appear by what follows:

1. That Bond proceeds on a falſe Narrative, *viz.* That the Queen being weary of the Government, had freely reſigned the ſame in Favours of her Son; when it appeared not long after, that ſhe was threatened with immediate Death if ſhe did not put her Hand to that Reſignation; and no Doubt but that (ſuch was the Wickedneſs of the Faction) would have been her Fate had ſhe refuſed.

2. As it was expreſſed in their Acts of Parliament, and ſworn by ſome of the Ringleaders of the Faction, that the Queen's Dimiſſion of the Crown was free and un-

unconſtrained, what could the Nobility and others, who had put their Names to that Bond, do, but acknowledge him for their King, who, after his Mother's ſuppoſed Abdication, was the next immediate Heir, and their *native Prince*, as they there call him?

3. We are informed by the above Inſtructions, *&c.* that the Earls of *Huntly*, *Argile*, Lord *Herries* and others, did in that Parliament enter a Proteſt, that unleſs the Queen, when at Liberty, ſhould publickly declare before them, that her Reſignation of the Crown was abſolutely voluntary and without Conſtraint, then all that had paſt on that Occaſion ſhould be accounted void and null, and ſuch as ſhould lay no Obligation upon them.

4. We are told in the ſame Inſtructions, that the chief Thing that prevailed with them to own the young King's, or rather the Earl of *Murray*'s Authority, was the Fear they were in, that if they had not ſubmitted, the Queen's Enemies would have taken away her Life, as they had oft-times threatened to do.

5. What confirms this not a little, is that after the Queen had fled to *England*, ſeverals of thoſe great Men that had ſubſcribed the E. of *Murray*'s Bond, are the very ſame Perſons that put their Names to the above Inſtructions in Favours of their exiled Queen, ſuch as the Earls of *Huntlie*, *Argile* and *Errol*, the Lords *Sanquhar* and *Roſs*; and no doubt ſo would many others, had they been then on the Spot.

6. That many of thoſe Subſcriptions were as little voluntary as the Queen's Reſignation, appears from this, that it took up no leſs than four Months and ſome Days to obtain Hands to that Bond; for we are told, in a Note ſubjoined to it in Mr. *Anderſon*'s Collections, "That the "Subſcribers began to ſign it upon the 25th Day of *Ju-* "*ly*, and continued to ſign it as they came in till the "*December* following, that the Parliament met." From which we may rationally infer, that no ſmall Force was uſed in the Affair. For as the Faction had got moſt of the Strengths of the Kingdom into their Hands, and were aſſured of Aſſiſtance from *England*, it is hardly to be doubted but that a great Number of theſe Subſcribers

threatened with Death and Deſtruction if they did not own the E. of *Murray*'s Authority, by putting their Hands to that Bond.

7. But what puts the Matter out of all Doubt is, that when the Queen had made her Eſcape from the Caſtle of *Lochleven*, on the 2d of *May* following, *anno* 1568, a great Number of the chief Nobility and Gentry of the Kingdom, and among them ſeverals of thoſe that had ſigned the E. of of *Murray*'s Bond, conveened at *Hamilton*, and there ſubſcribed a new *Bond*, quite contrary to the former one. This Bp. *Burnet* and Mr. *Anderſon* have thought fit to over-look, as making directly againſt their Purpoſe. But becauſe it is a convincing Proof of what I have ſaid, I ſhall firſt give it a Place in this Appendix, and then make ſome proper Obſervations upon it.

The Bond of nine Earls, nine Biſhops, eighteen Lords, and others, for Defence of the Queen's Majeſty, 8th May, 1568 (*a*).

TIll all and ſindrie quhome it effeiris, to quhais Knawlege thir preſent Letteris ſall cum; We the Prelatis, Erlis, Lordis, Baronis, Gentilmen and Burrowis eftir ſpecifiit, having conſiderit that it hes pleiſit God Almichtie of His infinite Power to put to Libertie our Soverane Lady the Queenis Majeſtie furth of the Handis of hir Hienes diſobedient and unnaturall Subjectis, quha have preſumit and preiſit thameſelffis to hald hir maiſt nobill Perſoun in Preſoun this lang tyme paſt, for thair awin Prehemenence and Particularities, menaſſand and boiſtand frae tyme to tyme to tak hir Majeſties Lyff maiſt unjuſtlie from hir, expreſs againſt all luifable Lawis of God and Man. For the

(*a*) Bp. *Keith* has publiſhed this Bond in his Hiſtory, P. 475. taken from a Tranſcript of it from the *Cotton* Library, *Caligula*, C. 1. by the late Mr. *Crawford* of *Drumſoy*; but which is here corrected in ſeveral Places from a more exact Copy.

the quhilk His greit Benefeit grantit to us hir trew Subjectis in hir Delyverance foirſaid, we render to Him all Thankis and hartlie Praiſe. And ſeeing alſwa that it is the bundin Dutie of all trew Subjectis, with thair Bodies, Landis and Gudis to ſerve and obey thair native Soverane, in the quhilk Place undoubtitlie Almichtie God hes gevin her Hienes abuſe us to reegn, quhilk we maiſt earneſtly pray his Godhead may lang continew to his Glorie, and alſwa to our warldlie Comfort; We thairfoir, and every ane of us, promiſis and obliſs us, in the Name of the Eternall GOD, faythfullie and trewlie upon our Lawtie and Honours in the Warld, That we ſall ſerve and obey trewlie our ſaid Soverane Lady, our naturall Princeſs, as hir Hienes faythfull Liegis and Subjectis, againſt all her Enemies and utheris hir Graces diſobedient and unnaturall Subjectis, with our Bodies, Landis and Gudis, Friendis, Servandis, Aſſiſtaris and Partakeris, to the ſetting forward of hir Hienes Auctoritie, Honour, Common-weill of our native Realme, and Leigis thairof, unto the uttermaiſt of our Power unto our Lyffis End; and alſwa, becauſe we sé the greit Diſobedience preſentlie pretendit agains hir Grace and hir trew and obedient Subjectis: We thairfoir in manner foirſaid, binds and obliſs us, and everie ane of us, trewlie and faythfullie to tak an trew and anefald plain Part with utheris in Defence of ourſelffis, Bodies, Gudis, Landis, Rowms, Poſſeſſions, Men, Tennentis, Servandis, Friendis and Aſſiſtaris, and in Perſute of thame that beis foundin diſobedient to our ſaid Soverane Lady and hir Auctoritie: And to that Effect, that na Diſtance nor Grudge ſall remane nor ryſs amangis us, our Friendis and Servandis, for ony Actioun or Cauſe criminal or civil bypaſt; We alſwa be thir Preſentis referris all ſic Actionis and Cauſis that preſentlie is or ſhall happin heirefter to be amangis us, to the Ordour and Commandment of our ſaid Soverane Lady, or the Lordis of hir Hienes Counſall, or ony three or four of thame that hir Hienes pleiſis to command to accept the Deciſioun thairof upon thame; and however thai decern thairintill, we obliſs us faythfullie to ſtand and abyde thairat, and ſall in nawayis perſew ony Actionis aganis

utheris without hir Hienes Licence, unto the Tyme that hir Majeſtie hald Parlement, and be fulliele eſtabliſſit in her Quenelie Honour and Obedience; obleiſſand ilk ane of us to utheris, but Fraud or Guile, upon our Lawties, Honours and Fidelities, and nevir to have Faith nor Credit, bot to be reputit and haldin as opin and manifeſt Traitoris, gif we come in contrare the Tenour of the Premiſſis in ony ſort. In Witneſs of the quhilk, we and everie ane of us hes ſubſcryvit thir Preſentis with our Hand at *Hamiltoun*, the Aucht Day of *Maij*, the Zeir of God, Ane thouſand fyve hundred threſcoir and aucht Zeiris.

Archibald E. of *Argile*, *George* E. of *Huntly*, *Hugh* E. of *Eglinton*, *David* E. of *Crawfurd*, E. of *Caſſilis*, E. of *Rothes*, E. of *Montrois*, E. of *Sutherland*, E. of *Errol* Conſtable. *John Abp. of* St. Androis, *John* Bp. of *Dunkeld*, *John* Bp. of *Roſs*, *Alexander* Bp. of *Galloway*, *Alexander* Bp. of *Aberdene*, *Robert* Bp. of *Brechin*, *John* Bp. of the *Iſles*, *James* Bp. of *Argile*, *John* Bp. of *Murray*. Lords, *Fleming*, *Livingſton*, *Seton*, *Robert* L. *Boyd*, *Somervell*, *Herries*, *Roſs*, *Maxwel*, *Ogilvy*, *Oliphant*, *William* L. *Borthwick*, *Sanchar*, *William* L. *Hay* of *Zeſter*, *Drummond*, *Elphinſton*, L. *Claud Hamilton*, *Sinclair*, *Cairleil*. Abbots, *St. Colm's Inch*, *Lindoris*, *Glenluſs*, *Halywood*, *New-Abbay*, *Dundrennan*, *Saulſide*, *Corſe-Regal*, *Inſchafray*, *Kelſo*; Prior *Pluſcarti*, Prior *Lahteim*. Barons, Laird of *Lochinvar*, *Baſs*, *Waughton*, *Roſlin*, *Corſtorphin*, *Johnſton*, *Weems*, *Balwery*, *Torry*, *Dalhouſie*, *Farnihirſt*, Sheriff of *Teviotdale*, *Lamington*, *Calderwood*, *Closburn*, *Lanton*, *Traquair*, *Keir*, *Garder*, *Airth*, *Clackmannan*, *Sauchy*, *Tulliallan*, *Findlater*, *Barnbougal*, *Greenhead*, *Bamff*, *Haddo*, *Rowallan*, *Drummalzier*, *Coilſtoun*, *Samuelſtoun*, *Quhitford* of that Ilk, *Robert Boyd* of *Baddenneth*, *Jerviſwood*, *James Johnſton* of *Torry*, *Robert Johnſton* of *Lochmaben*, *John Creichton* of *Ryhill*, Sheriff of *Air*, Sir *James Hamilton* Kt. Sheriff of *Clidſdale*, *Robert* Maſter of *Sempil*, *Thomas* Maſter of *Boyd*, Laird of *Bombie*, *Skirling* Kt. Laird of *Boyn*, *Boghall*, *Innerwick*, *Stenhouſe*, *Dunrod*, *Craigehall*, *Arniestoun*,

ſtoun, *Kilburny*, Laird of *Cockpule*, *Neil Montgomery* Kt. *Patrick Congilton* of that Ilk, *Pollock*, *Ladyland*, *Smeton*, *Preſton* Kt. *Caldwell* Kt. Maſter of *Kneland*, *James Steuart* of *Cardonald*, Laird of *Kneland*, *Cambnetham*, *Lauchop*, *Barclanochan*, *Gawſton*, *Romano*, *Cranſton* Kt. *Newton* of that Ilk, *Bandenoth*, *Belſtanes*, *Quhitford*, Sir *Andrew Ker* Kt. Sheriff of *Linlithgow*, *Gairtlie*, *Silverton* Kt. *Haining*, *Rickarton*, *Ardkinlas*, *Dalziel*, *Semenance*, *Lickprevick*, *Corhouſe*, *Robert Lawſon of Humby*, *Erſilmont*, *Macintoſh*, *Geycht*, *Cryech* Kt. *Abergeldy*, *Quhitelaw*.

From this Bond I obſerve,

1. That it is wonderful and truly ſurpriſing that ſo great a Number of the moſt conſiderable Perſons in the Kingdom (being no fewer than 9 Earls, 9 Biſhops, 18 Lords, 10 Abbots, 2 Priors, and upwards of 90 inferior Barons and other landed Gentlemen) ſhould conveen together at one Time and Place, and that within ſix Days after the Queen's Eſcape from *Lochleven* Caſtle, and four Days before the fatal Battle of *Langſide*, which obliged her to take Refuge in *England*. This is a plain Proof that the Senſe of the Bulk of the Nation was quite otherwiſe than what Bp. *Burnet* and others have repreſented; and that the Subſcribers of this Bond were actuated with a Spirit of true Loyalty to their injured Sovereign, and a juſt Reſentment of the complicated Wickedneſs of her Adverſaries.

2. That the Subſcriptions to this Bond were free and voluntary, appears from the ſhort Time in which the Subſcribers were to meet, and not as thoſe of the other Bond, which took up more than four Months to gather in Hands to it.

3. Eſpecially if we add, that ſeverals of thoſe who ſubſcribed the E. of *Murray*'s Bond are likewiſe Subſcribers of this: Which being contradictory to the other, plainly ſhews, that their Concern for the Queen's Safety, and for their own Lives and Fortunes had conſtrained them to put their Names to that former Bond.

4. That tho' the Subſcribers of that former Bond were more

more numerous than thoſe that put their Names to this laſt, yet if we conſider the Power and Intereſt that theſe had in the Kingdom, we will find them rather ſuperior than inferior to them that ſubſcribed the former Bond: Eſpecially if we add, that the Shortneſs of the Time did not allow a great many others to meet with them, who no doubt would have joined in that Aſſociation (*a*).

(*a*) *Note*, That only 8 Earls, 14 Lords, 1 Biſhop, and 4 Commendatars of Abbays ſign the E. of *Murray*'s Bond; whereas the other Bond is, as I ſaid, ſubſcribed by 9 Earls, 18 Lords, 9 Biſhops, 10 Abbots: And of theſe, 3 Earls, 3 Lords and 1 Biſhop are Subſcribers to that other Bond. And whereas Bp. *Burnet* thinks it of no ſmall Moment in this Affair, that beſides the Earls and Lords who ſet their Hands to that firſt Bond, *there are fifteen others whoſe Families are ſince that Time advanced to be of the Nobility*; I can eaſily balance Accompts with him, by ſhewing that a greater Number of the Families of thoſe Gentlemen that ſubſcribed the ſecond Bond, have ſince been advanced to the Honour of Peerage, *viz.* the Marquiſſes of *Lothian* and *Annandale*; the Earls of *Aberdeen*, *Carnwath*, *Dalhouſie*, *Drumfries*, *Elgin* and *Ailsbury*, *Findlater*, *Kincardin*, *Lowdon*, *Traquair* and *Weems*; the Viſcounts of *Kenmure*, *Cranſton* and *Garnock*; the Lords *Dingwall*, *Forreſter* and *Kirkcudbright*; in all 18; *i. e.* three more than thoſe whom the Biſhop mentions; and perhaps there are ſome others whoſe Genealogy I am not able to trace. But (what is moſt remarkable) there are not a few who put their Names to both Bonds; to this laſt, as I ſaid, of their own free Will; but to the former, by the Terror they were brought under by them that had got the Power in their Hands.

BSB Bayerische StaatsBibliothek

MDZ Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek

Ruddiman, Thomas

Animadversions on a late Pamphlet intitled a vindication of George Buchanan

Edinburgh 1749

Biogr. 152 i
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10062061-5